



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

GIFT OF

Class

New York State Education Department

ADDRESSES AND PAPERS

BY

ANDREW S. DRAPER, LL.B., LL.D.

Commissioner of Education

1907



CONTENTS

	PAGE
Appointing Officers and Civil Service Regulations	3
The Nation's Responsibilities Concerning Dependent Peoples	19
What Next about Union University?	38
The Schools and International Peace.....	53
The American Type of University.....	62
New York's Obligations to Her History	76
Illiteracy in the United States.....	95
A Federal Educational Plan Needed	101
National Systems of Education	109
What the Women's Clubs May Do for the Schools.....	128



APPOINTING OFFICERS AND CIVIL SERVICE REGULATIONS

ADDRESS AT THE CONFERENCE OF STATE AND MUNICIPAL CIVIL
SERVICE COMMISSIONERS, HELD IN THE SENATE CHAMBER AT
ALBANY, ON OCTOBER 11, 1906

Mr President:

You have very courteously invited me to discuss the State civil service laws and regulations from the standpoint of officers who have to make appointments. If a multiplicity of appointments could qualify one for the duty I might be expected to be able to meet it, for there are something like three hundred employees in the Education Department and there are few of them whose status has not been changed, upon my responsibility, in the last two and a half years, since the educational unification act went into operation. Still, I am bound to say that I have no special preparation for the task your courtesy has assigned to me, and I know I shall stand sorely in need of your consideration when I accept such a conspicuous and favorable opportunity for the expression of my rambling thoughts upon an exceedingly important subject.

The last report of your commission, Mr President, shows that January 1, 1906, there were 84,479 persons in the employ of the State and the counties and cities of the State subject to civil service laws. Of these, 61,861 were in the classified service. I have no exact information concerning the compensation of this service. If the average annual salary is \$750, which seems small, then the total cost is about \$63,000,000. To insure decent appointments, to protect places from imposition and occupants from outrage, to encourage competency and assiduity by proper rewards and make certain of reasonable justice as between rivals, to keep all of this employment and all of this money from appealing to the cupidity of the indolent and from debauching the sentiment of the State, to assure a service which is competent, alert, responsive, and polite, and which at the same time can be resistive and which will never sell out the interests for which it stands, provides a fit study for an expert and a very proper ground for solicitude on the part of all good citizens.

There are plenty of people who are unable to see why unlimited

authority does not always put an ideal appointee in every place in the public service. They do not realize that there is no unlimited authority in representative government; that the flesh of popular sentiment and the blood of common support as well as the naked skeleton of statute law are factors in the case; that ideal men seldom want the place, and that unideal men always do; that other tests than written examinations, which often ascertain what one does not know rather than what he does know, are necessary to determine one's fitness for a place; and that temperament and adaptiveness, even discrimination, experience and courage, are quite as vital as literary scholarship and general culture to expertness and usefulness in the public service.

There are other people to whom it has never occurred that any American citizen needs any other qualification than that of getting enough votes for an office, or gathering enough influence to secure an appointment, in order to prepare him for any office from the presidency to the constablenesship with which one of the presidents frequently boasted that he began his official life. They do not see why one has anything to do with politics if it is not to secure a job. Their wrath runs high if offices are not the early fruits of their political victories; though their faith is shaken when it comes to the victories of the other people. They do not know, or if they do they are — for the time being — indifferent to the fact that any such theory is the sure forerunner of both personal and party humiliation.

There are still other people, and many of them, who do not take the trouble to think about the matter, who care for little which does not promise advantage to themselves, and who lack the taste or the energy for political activity. They keep quiet, refrain from stirring opposition, and take advantage of any wind from any quarter. When they want something, they want it very badly. Then they can not understand why every interest should not turn aside for theirs. Seeking something, they think that the laws and rules are made only to fool the uninitiated, and when disappointed they are very skeptical about square and honest men in public life. Passing for most excellent people, professing rectitude, and possessing it so long as no selfish interest is in the way, they are singularly deaf to all reason and blind to all principle when a real test comes and conscience toys with temptation.

As there are people, so there are appointing officers, with very diverse outlooks. I have no means of striking an average between or making a composite picture of them. So I must proceed from

my own point of view. Of course, that has been determined by my reading and my experiences.

I have not been without experiences in politics. They were costly in time and productivity, but perhaps worth while. I do not look back upon those experiences with unlimited satisfaction, but I am grateful for the influences which they have exerted upon my understanding. There are two men, so far as politics is concerned, for whom I am sorry. One is the man in politics who has no other means of getting a living and no other entertainment than the excitement of the political campaign, and the other is the man out of politics who has never had the exhilaration of following a flag, the hilarity of whooping it up for a party ticket, the supreme joy of figuring up the returns on election night and finding that enough saints have, in the course of the day, recorded themselves upon — what seems to him — the Lord's side of the fight.

If there are any men who ought to command our admiration they are the men who are fitted for a profession or a vocation and live, or may easily live, by it and yet are decisive enough to be interested in politics, energetic enough to sustain a party, and capable and patriotic enough to be safe factors in the public service when occasion arises for it. Then if they develop real adaptation to public life they bring great strength to it. They are safer and more successful in the executive offices of the State or in the Legislature than others because they know the outlook and the ways of politics and are familiar with the routine and the atmosphere of official functions. There are altogether too sweeping popular impressions against men who are successful in politics and prominent in public life. As a rule they average quite as honest as other men would in like situation. They have gathered strength and balance out of their experiences. They see the best road more clearly than the inexperienced, and are able to withstand storms which would overwhelm the uninitiated.

Such men are not illogical or unreasonable about subordinate appointments. There are no more generous and wholesouled men in the world. They want to help others. They have been supported by others and the sense of gratitude has been developed with their other senses. The one thing that they can not afford is to be outwitted by other men in politics. It is death to be unable to get plunder which others can get. They have never accepted in its completeness the doctrine that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church. Whether it is or not, they do not intend to supply any blood for any such purpose. But they appreciate the

necessity of observing principles and the need of laws quite as well as other people, and if satisfied that these are being executed on the square, and that no hidden advantage is being given to another, they are ordinarily content. It is certainly within the fact that they are more philosophical than other people in quest of a job when disappointed, or that their discontent is better concealed and their grief less persistent. Wherever the factor of personal recommendation comes in, theirs is quite as discriminating and reliable as that of other people.

There have been overwhelming changes about all this in twenty-five years. A friend told me the other day of going to the head of one of the State departments in the early 80's, and asking for a vacant clerkship of a low grade. The answer was: "Young man, this is a political place. If you haven't got the most influence you can't get it." That evidences a state of things which is impossible now. It was possible then only because the public service was, even such a little time ago, primitive. In thirty years the things which the State and the municipalities are expected to do and the number of people who have to be employed to do them, have multiplied overwhelmingly. The growth of the service has created the necessity of going back to basic principles and making laws and regulations for their enforcement.

There are reasons enough why one who comes to the headship of a great department or an important work should have immediate and confidential assistants of his own free choice, so far as may be necessary to his personal comfort, to securing accurate information, and to executing any plans within the terms of his commission. There is no reason why all ordinary positions, capable of classification, which claim competency possible of measurement by known standards and which have no influence over any policies which the head of the department has been set to execute, should become the corrupting stakes of political contests.

And not only the decency and integrity of political parties, but the imperative efficiency, the respectability and the responsiveness of the public service; the rights of all who may be ambitious to enter it; the superior rights of persons of proved competency and adaptability already in it; and the steadily unfolding progress of the State — all are against such corruption.

It is easier to see that and to say it now than it used to be. Indeed, there was not the need of saying it in the earlier and more primitive times. When the need came, it took unusual and convincing foresight and much courage to say it. The men who did

say it were considered prudes and freakish and were visited with sarcasm and ridicule by the hotheaded and unthinking. The refinement and sensitiveness of Dorman B. Eaton, George William Curtis and Carl Schurz suffered keenly because of their convictions and their courage upon this subject. But their names will be familiar after those of multitudes who barked at them are forgotten.

When Senator Conkling, in the memorable Rochester convention of September, 1877, made his quite as memorable declaration that "When Dr Johnson defined patriotism as the last refuge of a scoundrel, he was unconscious of the then undeveloped capabilities and uses of the word 'reform,'" he was shaping a phrase to delight the delegates, but he was illustrating to us the distance between the general trend of the thinking of that day and the well established and accepted policies of our day.

When Senator Ingalls went to the White House and asked President Harrison to turn out a Democrat and appoint a Republican to a postoffice in Kansas, the President asked him how long before the term of the incumbent would end, and the Senator said he thought about three years. "Then Mr Cleveland allowed his Republican predecessor to fill out his term; don't you think we ought to do as well as Mr Cleveland did?" asked the President. "But, Mr President," snapped the Senator, "before you follow Mr Cleveland too much you had better think where Mr Cleveland is now." Yet Mr Cleveland's road led to the White House a second time and the Senator's made a bee line for Kansas.

Between the stinging remarks of these two brilliant senators something had happened which gave introspection and courage to presidents, if not to all senators. In the presidential campaign of 1884 it fell upon me to be chairman of the executive, or campaign committee of the Republican State Committee. You will some of you recall that there was some lack of enthusiasm and hilarity on my side in the week following the election. After it was all over I asked Mr George William Curtis why all of the Civil Service Reform people supported Mr Cleveland, and he told me a story. He said that in the middle of the campaign a hundred of the leaders of civil service reform held a secret meeting in New York. They had become embittered through the indifference of the Republican leaders, were ready to do almost anything, and undecided what to do. It was finally decided that Mr Curtis should communicate with Mr Cleveland, and then advise his associates and they would act upon his advice. He had no acquaintance with Mr Cleveland and determined to write him a letter, which he

intrusted to a mutual friend with the understanding that it should first be shown to Mr Cleveland and then delivered only if he should express his willingness to receive and answer it. The letter was shown to the Governor in his office, in this building, on a hot, August day. Somewhat to the surprise of those concerned, he said at once that he would gladly receive it and if his friend would return in an hour the answer would be ready for him. That answer set all of the influences at the command of the "reformers" into active operation for the Democratic candidate. Everybody knows now that they were sufficient to change the result of the election. Perhaps other interests were sufficient, but this was certainly sufficient. Such a change, from such a cause, was enlightening. It was enough to clarify the outlook of presidents and senators and all the rest of us who were not too obtuse to be in the reckoning.

Mr Dorman B. Eaton, who was for years the president of the National Civil Service Commission, wrote a book upon the civil service system of Great Britain some thirty years ago. At the request of President Hayes he visited England to investigate and report upon the system. He was obliged to do it without being reimbursed for his services or even his expenses by the government. His report was published as a private venture. It was not light reading. It was a long book, closely printed. It was a heavy book, in two senses. I bought and read it. I have just looked it up in anticipation of this address. I read it through, for I find my pencil marks and marginal comments from beginning to end. That was in 1882. The comments are not just what I would make now. Mr President, it was before your commission had been created. I had been chairman of the Republican County Committee of Albany county for three years and was just breaking out the road to the State committee. I do not mind saying that that book is an evidence which I would not now willingly dispense with. Either I was not as bad as I have believed I was in the midst of my youthful political activities, or else I made use of the best means of enlightenment before some older and very much more prominent men than I thought well to do so.

The book made an impression, for it treated in a very able way a very great subject. It is probably within the fact to say that in point of capacity and integrity there is no public service in the world equal to that of Great Britain. At Liverpool, or Halifax, or Melbourne, or Hong Kong, or Singapore, or wherever else the "Union Jack" floats, one may do business with a British officer

who is an honest man and who capably represents the British crown. Perhaps I ought to qualify. You may do business with him — if he is ready. It takes him a long time to get ready. He might remind you of the blunt old lady who, sitting on the middle of a bench in Central park and asked by a young man with his girl to move along so that they might sit together, answered, "No, I won't. New York ain't no place to be accommodatin' in." If he did, it would not be because he dropped the same letters she did, or had her pestiferous feelings, but because his temperament makes him deliberate and his training makes him resistive. In any event, he is part of a great, honest, and uniformly intelligent service. If he could have a little more of bending courtesy, a trifle more of cordial politeness, he would approach the ideal. As it is, he is a good character. He is made a better character because of the pride he has in his service. He puts H. M. S. (His Majesty's Service) upon his engraved visiting cards, and he writes it after his name in the hotel registers with the air of a man who feels that it is an honor to be associated with the British civil service.

The American cosmopolitan character, and particularly the jovial spirit of American politics, puts into the American public service the factors which the English service lacks. But the American service has not yet acquired all of the desirable ingredients which the British service has. It is not so old and, aside from that, it has more to contend with.

The provision in Magna Charta by which the King engaged not to "make any justices, constables, sheriffs, or bailiffs, but of such as know the law of the realm," was the first real stroke at the theory of the feudal kings that all public offices were their personal perquisites and that all appointees must become their personal retainers and supporters. But no one then conceived the extent of the intricacies of modern public service. It was six hundred years after Magna Charta before Great Britain began to take a rational attitude concerning the constitution of the civil service. We separated from her without bringing away any information or any laws or traditions upon that subject, and until real needs and dangers appeared the pioneer life and democratic government in this country were not as favorable to the systematic organization and regulation of the public service here as the economic and political conditions in the old country were favorable to it there.

Our country is a democracy. The British empire is a monarchy — a limited monarchy, it is true, but still a monarchy. Kings and

queens may come and go, but the crown stays in the family and goes on forever. They are never torn up by a presidential election. That is not saying that it would not be better if they were. Their parliamentary elections are far less frequent than ours. And when the control passes from one party to another and a new cabinet results, it has no effect upon the personnel of the civil service. They are distinctly opposed to frequent changes, while we seem to like them. But that is perhaps the least of it. The masses are deliberately kept from thinking that they may enter the public service. The sons of the higher orders are especially trained for that service. All the rest are destined to simple, unofficial employment, if not to personal service. They are in a bad, though rather promising, mix-up over there just now about elementary schools. They have no such universal, common, primary school system as ours. They have universities for the higher classes but the humbler classes do not think of going to them. They do not hear that if they do not go to college they will miss their opportunity in life. There is no system of high schools to connect the elementary schools with the universities. The boys are not told that they have an equal chance with every other boy to get up near the headship of the kingdom. If they were told so it would not be true. Not many are even headed for clerkships. The great body are destined for manual work. They follow their fathers. But they are not troubled about it. They are a capable, substantial, deliberate and contented people, who often have a better time of it and live longer than some of us who are everlastingly scrambling for the mountain peaks of learning and opportunity. That is not saying that it is not better to scramble. It is only proving the point that they have had less to contend with than we in perfecting civil service.

There is no better evidence of the ability of the American spirit to meet difficult questions, and of democratic government to surmount troublesome situations, than appears in the rapid strides which have been made in this country in the growth and the regulation of the civil service. It is a cumbersome, involved, and exceedingly sensitive subject. The interests of the service call for work of widely differing qualities. Men and women are very unlike in their capacity for doing things. That must be sifted out somewhat before the original appointment. Then, officials and clerks are very unlike about learning to do things after they have the opportunity. One becomes very expert, handy, agreeable, helpful and happy. Another grows moody, jealous, subtle, and

troublesome. If rewarded on the basis of merit, the first would go forward rapidly — and the other would go out. But there are endless things in public administration which in justice ought to be done which it is not expedient to do. You must be cautious about favoritism and prejudice. Time often helps you. If time does not settle the matter for you, you had better settle it for yourself, if you can. But the common rights of all citizens, and the legal rights of all in the public service must be absolutely guarded; and the moral rights which one always acquires through honesty, assiduity and real competency in doing things must be recognized also. In some way, specially trained men and women, who are few in numbers and who are not hunting places, must be had for specially expert duties. Graduates of the advanced schools must have due credit for that. The presumptions are in their favor. But the fact that a great many men and women who have never been in college can do a great many things better than a great many men and women who have been to college, must have recognition also. The situations are innumerable and their different shadings utterly beyond the common comprehension.

So far as may be, it is all to be governed by law and regulation. A system of laws and regulations which assumes to do it will be as complicated as the civil or penal code. It must be changed to meet new conditions, and it must be responsive to the growth of the service and the experiences of men and women who want to perfect it. Yet it must not be fickle. There must be substance and steadiness about it. It must stand the test of critical investigation. It must justify itself by its operation. It must accomplish what it undertakes.

Any lack of integrity in the system is absolutely fatal to it. If anybody can tamper with it; if things can be done in the dark which will not stand the light of day; if there are subtleties about it which really help partizanship, and if the men who are set to execute it are not its sincere friends, there is little hope for it. It is an accepted principle of international maritime law that a blockade in order to be binding must be effective. That is, that the law of nations will not allow a power at war to capture a neutral at a blockaded port unless it maintains a blockade which is effective enough to capture or be a real danger to all neutrals. In other words, a nation must do what it pretends, and it must be disposed and able to treat all alike. That principle is as vital in civil service law as in sea-going law. Whatever is undertaken must be efficiently accomplished, the blockade must be effective,

and all in like situations must be treated exactly alike, so far as law and regulation and sound purpose and good judgment can do it.

But again, while the civil service is to be controlled by law, the law is to be interpreted and executed by rational men. It is difficult, often impossible, to make a rule of law to meet all cases. So, in the enlargement and the management of the civil service, arbitrary devices or even set examinations do not meet all situations. Absolute justice as between candidates for appointment or as between associate employees desiring promotion is not possible. If nothing but an inflexible rule, or the ability to pass examinations set by persons who can not know the personal qualities of the candidate, were to govern, justice would often miscarry very widely. All persons charged with the execution of the laws study their purpose and observe their intent. One who does that rationally and sincerely and who can not be pulled around by personal or selfish interests need not be afraid. No censure worth minding falls upon an administrative officer who mixes with the law that guides him the good sense which he ought to have and the genuine intention to gain the law's ends which must be a part of his official equipment.

But the civil service laws go further than that. They expressly confer a wide discretion upon civil service officers and upon appointing officers. They expect all such officers to make liberal allowance for discipline gained in regular study in organized institutions, for actual experience and accomplishment as against the mere ability to pass examinations, for special study for special duties, for expertness in manipulation, for length of service, and for about everything which shows that one person has any real claim to consideration above another. And I am not sure that, with the general acceptance of the essential principles of civil service regulation, and with the fact thoroughly established that there is to be no hidden or unworthy preference given to any one, there will not be quite as much hurt to the service from the disinclination of officers to exercise the discretion which the law reposes in them as from any improper or corrupt stretching of it beyond its proper limits. There are plenty of officials who put responsibilities upon the law which the law puts upon officials. It is a convenient and safe way for the officials, but it often defeats the ends of the law and of administration. To be good laws, the civil service laws, above all laws, must have good executors.

The point of civil service regulations is to guard appointments

against incompetence, partizanship, favoritism and greed, and not to retain unsatisfactory employees in positions. If there is no way of getting a favorite into a vacancy, there is little probability that the vacancy will be created without reason. Common sentiment seems to exact less of an official clerk or messenger in a public office than in private employment. The head of the department who exacts what the manager of a private establishment must exact of employees gets much criticism for it. This is unjust, but it influences official action. If the official expects to bear his responsibility but for a couple of years, he is likely to fail to see a good many things which he will feel obliged to see if this responsibility is to be continuing. But in any event it is far from an agreeable duty to discharge an employee in a public office, and in the absence of the unlimited authority to fill the place there is more likelihood of too much that is wrong being submitted to than there is that there will be any undue exercise of the power of removal.

Discipline, the daily atmosphere which exacts regularity of attendance, aptness for work, responsiveness to authority, cheerfulness and self-respect, responsibility for specific duties and quick accountability, is as important to public service as original appointments or promotions in the service. That depends, not upon benevolent preachments alone, but upon rewards and punishments as well. It would be agreeable if we could feel that all people have correct intentions and character enough to carry them out. It would even be delightful if all the members of a large force of employees would do as well as they know. The larger number will; but the number who will see what kind of stuff their supervision is made of, who will think maneuvering will gain them an advantage, and who will limit their travels in the wrong direction only by the likelihood of their losing their heads, is by no means a negligible quantity. If they can rely upon outside influence to protect them against themselves, the service is broken down, every honest associate in the service is outraged, and they themselves are doomed to mediocrity and to a dependent, hollow, false life. Régime — system — is imperative. It is stronger than individuals; it is the helper and the protection of individuals. It is not easily corruptible and it is not quickly fickle. But it is to be based upon justice and guided by sense. Theory and practice must be consistent; law and administration must cooperate; civil service commissions and executive officers and subordinate employees must all help one another in cheerful submission to a system which

is greater than any of them; and public sentiment must be educated to sustain both public law and public officers, if there is to be any satisfaction in public service and if the high ends of democratic government are to be reasonably or measurably met.

There is no trouble about original appointments to subordinate positions. About all that mere youngsters are good for is to try examinations. All they can ordinarily show is what they can do in passing examinations. Just out of school, they can often do that better than their elders can. It does not prove a great deal — about enough to entitle the best of them to their chance. It is convenient enough for an appointing officer to push a button when there is a vacancy, get the names which stand near the head of the eligible list, look the aspirants over, find that some won't do at all, and that others are getting better than \$30 per month, and finally pick out the one who has come up with his first real opportunity in the world and is anxious to seize it.

As you go on the road, the big potatoes work to the top, the medium ones hold comfortable but not conspicuous places in the middle of the load, and the little ones work out under the tail-board of the wagon. So it is with boys and girls in the public service. There is some difficulty in so arranging it that the ones who are destined for the top can get there as soon as they ought, and so that the ones who must work out under the end board shall accomplish that as soon as may be well, but, happily, they are young and can wait, and what ought to be comes around in some way in its own good time.

When it comes to higher grade positions and to more highly specialized duties, and to older and more expert people who have already had their feet on the ground and accomplished some things, the course is not so clear. Some preference should, in all justice to individuals, and for the highest good of the service, be given to those who are in the line of promotion, have proved their worth in subordinate places, have shown their disposition to make the most of themselves and of their opportunities, and are familiar with routine. How much preference should be given them is a question which none but a sane and true civil service commission is legally competent to determine. Certainly that preference should not go so far as to lead any to think that all must come in at the foot of the service, or that all who do will reach the top if only they outlive all the rest. The factors that give them the right to special preferment must clearly be special and all-round intellectual resourcefulness, special aptness and expertness, and special worth

because of special accomplishments. Every one who has rendered a specially faithful and competent service to his state or city has laid the state or city under some obligation to him, which ought to be regarded when the opportunity for rewarding that service arises. But this can hardly be carried so far as to exclude all the others who may have a broader culture, greater resourcefulness and keener competency gained in study and training in other lines either outside or inside of the public service. Here the examination must be deeper and more specialized, and when it is and allowance is made for things done and for recognized qualifications outside of the ability to pass set examinations, no injustice is likely to be done.

I do not wish to seem to underestimate the value of examinations in the middle grades of the service. If duties are special, they claim some special mastery of a subject. One who has mastered a special field is likely to be able to show it in an examination, and one who has not is likely to reveal the fact that he has not mastered the subject. If he does not remember a particular fact, which may be but ought hardly to be called for in an examination, he can certainly show the extent of his grasp of the subject. If examinations are set to elicit what candidates know, rather than what they do not know, there will be little difficulty. And the ability to write intelligently and intelligibly about what one knows is the best proof of the special knowledge and of the general competency which are equally requisite.

In this connection it may be worth while to inquire why it is not practicable to accept in civil service tests the credits which candidates may have earned in the State academic examinations. Examinations ought not to be unnecessarily multiplied. Each part of the public service may well support other parts, whenever practicable. Work in the secondary schools might, so far as I can see, very well be encouraged by the support which recognition in the public service would give to it. It is not only recognized but required for admission to the colleges and the learned professions. The academic examinations are very well set. We hope that they are to be still better prepared through the management of the State Examinations Board which is just being organized, whose function it will be to make the examinations illustrative of the best teaching and responsive to the latest educational progress. No one questions the integrity of the academic examinations. They are practically universal in the State except in the City of New York and are now to become operative in that city, for the Board

of Education of that city yesterday determined to make them so. The system distinguishes our State. Its results are recognized in all the states. They are accorded good value for all purposes in this State except for admission to the civil service. A State standard good for one State purpose ought to be good for other State purposes at least. These standards represent good and uniformly reliable educational values, better than any others in America outside of the good colleges and universities. They are, I know, having some inevitable bearing upon civil service appointments. Why should they not have complete and legal recognition? It would doubtless lighten the burdens of the civil service examiners and articulate your work with that of the State Education Department in ways which would be to the advantage of all interests that are concerned.

Returning to the subject from which there has been a slight digression, it is submitted that perhaps the most difficult task with which the public service has to deal is the securing of specially trained experts for the highest positions in the service. Very likely the very technical scientific and library work of the State, which is in charge of the Education Department, makes that department peculiarly subject to this difficulty. It frequently happens that we must have specialists like whom there are not many in the nation. We need the best there is. The man whom we want is not looking for a place. He is already in one where he is esteemed, and he is hardly open to negotiations because he does not wish to seem to lightly regard the place where he is, or to disturb his present employers without practical certainty that the way is open to him to go to another place of greater conspicuity, emoluments and usefulness. He does not wish to sign a formal application and he would refuse to submit to a written examination. We have had several situations like this on our hands in the past year, and we have secured the men we wanted through the very cordial sympathy and the very wise course of the State Civil Service Commission, who have employed special examiners of well known standing and complete information of the subject to make ratings of the men who were in the zone of consideration, and available. And doubtless we should not trouble ourselves overmuch so long as things go well, but one can not help wondering what might happen if a less discriminating and courageous attitude should be taken by a Commission. There are not a few instances and many shadings of situations such as I have described which are exceptional and were not contemplated by the civil

service laws, and which must have the help of the Civil Service Commission if the laws and regulations are to level up and not level down.

On the whole, I am glad enough to be able to say freely that I have no adverse comment to pass upon the laws and regulations, and no criticism to make upon the course of the Civil Service Commission. The system, though intricate and involved, seems very complete, and the commission and its officers have evinced every disposition to meet real situations in practical ways. We have clearly had the same purposes and ends in view, and when that is true, discussion and cooperation find the way out.

Indeed, I have some sense of personal obligation. If, since the educational reorganization in this State, it had been necessary for me to measure up the scholarship of all of the employees of the two former departments and of others who wanted appointments, or if it had been necessary to weigh the rival influences which those people might bring to bear, nothing else would have been done and I would have been utterly destroyed in the midst of an impossible undertaking.

It is a pleasure to express very earnestly my estimate of the work of the Commission, in view of the difficulties with which it has to deal, and the allurements, the scarcely disguised coercion, and the subtle temptations which it must resist. It is doubtful if any of the rest of us have so exacting and perhaps so thankless a mission, and none of us, not even the Court of Appeals with all its legal subtleties, or the Superintendent of Public Buildings with all his persistent tribulations, is entitled to so much public gratitude for public service so provocative of ill temper, when it is done with a rectitude and sagacity that produces such a minimum of swearing.

It is a great privilege to engage in the public service of the central state in the Union. It is a great honor and a great responsibility to be trusted with legal authority bearing upon the character and the competency of that service. What New York does other states will do. No state dare turn back from the task of making its public service the cleanest and the best that it can. But a state will go forward only as fast as the civic spirit and conscience gain the strength and find the way to overcome the forces which would debauch and dishonor it, and wake to activity the forces which have good intentions but mighty indifferent ways of giving them effect. It often seems as though a state will go forward upon moral questions only as fast as the dangers menace

and the needs compel. But there is a great satisfaction in the fact that a state never goes back, that it goes steadily forward as fast as the urgent needs of its public life demand, and that when an American community is really aroused and has a chance upon moral questions, it uniformly throws the weight of its conscience upon the right side and breaks out the road for a distinct advance. The opportunities in this State have not been infrequent, and the uplifts have not been few or inconsequential. The outlook is encouraging. The State is doing more things and doing them better than it used to do. In its wealth, physical energy, industrial enterprises, and educational activity, in the spirit, the cleanliness, and the scientific capacity of its professional life, in new and great engineering undertakings, and in the rational freedom and the independent and courageous expression of its thinking, it brings untold advantage to all who have any part in its onward sweep. It is a great honor to have any opportunity to weave a single thread into such a history. Such a thread should not be colored too much by partizanship, and it should not be rotted by any meanness. If one of that kind is put in, it may not stay. Time must be taken to get it out and put in another. Whoever puts in good, clean, strong threads will not claim any return for it. But he will put the Empire State of the Union under obligations to him, and there can be no higher compensation than that.

THE NATION'S RESPONSIBILITIES CONCERNING DEPENDENT PEOPLES

OPENING ADDRESS BY DR DRAPER AS PRESIDENT OF THE LAKE MOHONK
CONFERENCE OF FRIENDS OF THE INDIANS AND OTHER DEPENDENT
PEOPLES, OCTOBER 17, 1906

The business of this conference is to get at the truth and declare the attitudes which ought to be taken by the people and the government of the United States towards those peoples who have become subject to the sovereignty of the Republic without being able to understand the spirit of it or bear a share of the burden of it.

We have not come up here to discuss whether what is written in the histories ought to have happened. We have come to meet serious present day questions with the latest information and the best thinking we can bring to them.

We are to divest ourselves of all prejudices or conceits, even of all social, political, or sectarian partizanship, to the end that we may give to our country a service which shall be distinctly patriotic.

Our generous host has invited us here because he believes that a few of us have special knowledge of the Indians, the Porto Ricans, the Hawaiians, and the Philippine peoples, and because he is assured that all of us would extend more than legal justice—even fraternal and generous help—to all peoples under our flag who must have assistance before they can have any share in the heritage, the philosophy, the burdens, and the joys of the nation. It is safe to say that none has been called or omitted because he lives or is unable to live in a set, because he worships or neglects to worship under the forms of any particular denomination, or because he votes or refuses to vote within the lines of a political party. It is quite as safe to say that no one is here who hates other men only because of their riches, their poverty, their politics, or their religion, and that none is not here because he has alliances and cherishes them, or holds opinions and believes in them very deeply.

In such a conference speech must be free. There need be no fear of conflicting opinions. If one has information he had better tell it. If he has convictions he may well express them. It mat-



ters not what others may know or think. He will set them right, or they will bring him back to the middle of the road. If he "knows things that are not so" he ought to find it out—and probably will. If the discussion is sincere it will not be too forceful. The truth of most worth is hammered out upon the anvil of red hot discussion.

We must have fundamental principles in mind. We must aim at the general policies which ought to be enforced, or the flagrant omissions and abuses which ought to be remedied. We can not have much to do with the details of administration. We can not get snarled up in technical matters which experts ought to be allowed to monopolize; and we can not deal with mere incidents which actual and honest workers are settling in the best way they can.

That every man is entitled to equality of security and of opportunity with every other man is a fundamental principle of the moral law. Our national political philosophy of course declares that. But it goes further. It declares that sound American policy must not only decree equality under the law and assure every one who comes under our flag his chance, but that the strength and security of the nation are promoted by encouraging and aiding, and sometimes by even forcing, people to make the most of their chance. This is a democracy and we have learned that its worth and its strength depend upon the units which have share in it.

The Lake Mohonk conferences have been doing this in the interests of the Indians for twenty-four successive years. They have declared principles which many denied, and stood for policies which appeared impossible, but soon those principles and policies appealed to the sense and the justice of the people and in a little time they grew into the law of the nation.

From this mountain the demands for justice and opportunity for the Indian have gone forth. It was not such justice as strong men or a great people claim as their inherent right, but the nobler justice which unfortunate men and a little and unlettered people must have before they can see the light or have any part in our civilization.

When it has seemed like crying against the wind, these conferences have declared for filling the Indian offices of the government with men who have more than activity in politics to commend them, for Indian administration upon the merit basis, for protecting our red children against rapacity and greed, for giving them every penny of public moneys that by any moral law belongs to them,

for using tribal and trust funds to the exclusive advantage of the *cestui que trust*, for the training of the head and heart and hand harmoniously, for schools and compulsory attendance, for unprejudiced standing in real courts, for a real marriage relation, for the division of lands held jointly, for work and the development of industries, for unrestricted trade with others, for rewards for thrift, and punishment for crimes, and for all civic rights and responsibilities.

The Indian question of 1906 is a wholly different question from the one of 1880 or 1890 or even 1900. The commonly accepted thought of the nation steadily becomes nobler, the government support steadily becomes more generous but also more discriminating, and the system of management or administration steadily becomes more exact, capable and responsible. While it is likely that there will be enough to do in the interests of the Indians for an indefinite time, still the assurance is not lacking that the sentiment of the country has been clarified, that the trends are in the right direction, that substantial results are rapidly developing, and that the time which is vital to all large movements in behalf of many people will bring very satisfactory results and give added proof of the competency of a democracy to deal with very troublesome situations.

But the rather promising outlook upon Indian matters is now accompanied by what are undoubtedly more difficult problems in the vast territory and among the millions of undeveloped people for whom we almost unwittingly assumed responsibility when we deliberately took Cuba from the further domination of Spain.

The difficulties seem greater because the numbers are greater. The Indian population is something like 300,000 and the population of the Philippine Islands, Hawaii, and Porto Rico is something like 10,000,000. The difficulties are greater because of remoteness of situation, because of the lack of environment and the infrequency of contact; greater because of more sharply defined physiological differences, of even more thoroughly entrenched superstitions and pagan customs, of yet more completely segregated racial individuality and autonomy; and greater because of their many languages, because so far as any tongue dominates it is one to which the words *democracy* and *liberty* are essentially foreign, and because of the extreme difficulty of imposing upon such a heterogeneous mass the English speech, without which the American spirit and our free and secure civilization can hardly be conveyed in a thousand years.

Great as this burden is, it has been appointed for us. Our national situation and character made it necessary. It has come without our seeking, and in what must be deemed to be the logical progress of the life of the world and the natural unfolding of the plan of the Almighty. We will articulate with any such advance and accept our part in any such plan. Under such conditions nothing is impossible.

Conquest for the sake of empire is repugnant to the thought of the men and women of this country who settle things. It is repugnant because it is idle and because it is wicked. So, too, is any refusal to bear the nation's proper part in the progress of the world. The indefinite continuance under our sovereignty of millions of people who can not share in our sovereignty, without our trying to develop them so that they may have a share in it, would be abhorrent to us, also. We are not accustomed to mere dependencies. Inferior or subordinate peoples are anomalous under our political system. But there are some things we will not do. We will not cast them away because we can not see the end. We will not, for a mess of pottage, trade them with some other nation which has no such outlook or mission as we have come to have in the world. Neither will we enter upon another experiment of enfranchising millions before they can, without danger to themselves and us, carry some part of the burden of governing the world. We will not give them independence until they can be independent. When that time comes it is doubtful if they will want it, but if they do, and their independence will not menace us, they should have it. The question is not the one which confronted us in 1865. But we have nothing to do with that now. The business of the hour is to develop the industrial habits and the moral sense and the political wisdom of these people so that they may be safely admitted into our sovereignty, or may be able to exercise sovereignty and independence of their own. That we must do, or prove that it is impossible, or dishonor ourselves.

We may well believe that our island dependencies are not temporary responsibilities; not passing episodes in our history. We shall have them for a long time after the novelty of the matter has worn off. There seems no reason for confidence that many of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands will be ready for the rights of American citizenship or for independence in the present generation. Therefore, the courses we pursue must anticipate a long run.

Millions of the people we are thinking about live in houses that are not worth five dollars each—even if you are in the market

for shacks. The clothes they wear have not taxed their energy or ingenuity overmuch. The food they eat grows without their help, in untilled fields or in the waters. Neither their sports nor their missionary activities are costly. Every Moro carries a murderous knife — and often they have more wives than knives. Without any knowledge of balanced rights and obligations, they pass their time in loafing and smoking and fishing and cock-fighting, and these occupations are not conducive to such knowledge. In many ways they are without the physical, intellectual and moral qualities found in the American Indian before contaminated by the worthless camp followers of white civilization.

It is not said, of course, that this is true of all, or of nearly all, but it is true of millions of the new peoples who have come under our care. We may well know the worst as well as the best of it. We must be cautious about the reports of officials and workers who are enthusiastic over good works done at single points on the edge of things, as well as about the reports of travelers who get only superficial views and are skeptical about all humanitarian undertakings.

The conference may well emphasize the fact that the United States can not hope to gain any strength or any wealth from such possessions as these. They can bring us nothing but care, expense and responsibility. If, in all good conscience, we do not know that we have a heavy task upon our hands, it would be better if we were out of it. If our generosity, our interest in extending civilization, and our confidence in the power of democratic government to bear its part in the conduct of the world, are not equal to the task, we may better turn back before we come to the point where we will incur greater humiliation. If we do understand that, and if there is fiber in our character and substance in our professions, we can not turn back. But the real situation and the theories which must determine what we are to do can not be too often impressed upon the common sentiment of the country.

The point of equipoise between administration from Washington and administration at Manila and Honolulu and Havana and San Juan is an interesting point which it is very desirable for us to locate. The moral sense of our wards will be developed or blunted by what happens at the official points of contact between us. The sense of justice, the outlook and purposes, the patience and forbearance, the evenness and steadiness and firmness of the civil and military representatives of the United States will have much

to do with the unfolding of moral sense among the unlettered children of the nation.

The readiness and cheerfulness with which their progress is rewarded by admitting them into participation in government, and the firmness with which that is refused, except when they show capacity and reliability, will have something to do with their evolution also.

Before anything else can be done the law must have its way. Security of life and property must be assured. In the beginning that is possible only through the army. And it may probably be said that the army has met its unexpected duty efficiently and with very considerable sense and discrimination.

But aside from the maintenance of order and security, the military power ought not to be much relied upon. It is pleasing to know that there are men in any American regiment who are equal to any moral service, but that agreeable fact must not blind us to the other fact that the experiences, traditions and mental attitudes of the army are such as to forbid its being the instrument, or of its being accepted as the instrument, of much constructive work.

Our own standards must begin to prevail. Law suited to the situation must be enforced. Crimes must be punished, and not only heinous crimes, but petty crimes and misdemeanors. It has long seemed to me that one of the prolific causes of the appalling negro question which is now upon this country appears in the fact that there has been no ready punishment for small crimes. In the Southern States the negro has been taken as a chattel and a joke. Little crimes seem to have been expected and to have gone unnoticed, or at least unpunished. This bred negro irresponsibility and developed a large crop of great crimes. A military tribunal which expresses and exercises force is not apprehensive about little offenses which are outside of and do not affect the military organization. Military authority in civil matters is understood to be but temporary. It must, as quickly as may be, give way to civil courts which will take cognizance of all offenses and have an eye on the long future. It does not seem desirable that military officers continue until native magistrates can be developed, if the process is to be slow. The American civil magistrate may well supplant the American military officer in our dependencies as soon as law can have its sway and order is secure. Then let the native civil magistrate be put in the place as soon as he is prepared for it. But let us profit by our Indian experience and beware of magistrates and courts who make a travesty of justice.

Whenever the flag of the Union is raised in any land it must speedily cast its shadow upon a school. It must be a school which is more than a form or a show. When a school comes to stand for the authority and character of the American people in a remote land, when it becomes the main reliance of all progress, it must be the living expression of the keenest moral energy and the hardest thinking which sprung out of the heart and mind of the Republic. It must be a practical and an adaptable school. It must not be too fast to undo any spiritual tendencies or any established forms of worship which it may find at its door. It must not undertake precipitately to change habits, dress, pastimes, or intellectual traits, so long as moral questions are not involved. It must not be organized upon a basis of expense common in the thrifty towns of the United States. It must know that the school and its constituency must be adjusted to each other if there is to be any enduring service, and that the school will have to do much of the adjusting to have it so. Above all, it must know that the only lasting training of any worth that one ever gets he gets through doing things; that one is never likely to be of much account who does not know the satisfaction of earning his bread in the sweat of his brow, and that any intellectual or moral advance which men and women ever make comes through the purpose and the power, not to break or to destroy, but to construct and to accomplish things.

What has been done in the way of opening schools has been well done. It was about the first thing the people thought of. It was an inspiration to see a capable superintendent and a thousand teachers start from the States upon the instant to carry the American system of common schools to unknown millions in far away lands. But it is almost impossible to make effective schools among an uninterested or antagonistic people. How primitive and inchoate these schools must be! They must be thoroughly adapted. They must be related together in a cohesive system. They must endure after the novelty has worn off. The people must be brought to accept them and support them, and then have pride in them. As quickly and as generally as may be, they must be taught by native teachers.

It is said that a hundred Filipino boys are distributed among our American universities — mostly among the state universities where there are colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts. It is said that they are bright and I have it from the university authorities that they do well. Doubtless the brightest boys are sent. They ought

to be. This is copying Japan. Japan has a general and effective system of elementary schools, with a very good system of advanced schools. We can not have one without the other. Japan secured both by inducing the most experienced American educationists to go to Japan and plan a school system, and by sending the most promising Japanese boys to American and European universities. If these Filipino boys do as well as the Japanese boys did, we will in thirty years have an educational system which has really taken hold of things in the Philippine Islands.

I have a good deal of confidence that it would be well to put the management of educational matters in charge of the United States Bureau of Education. That bureau always has a good man at its head. It has a staff of trained educational experts. It knows all about educational activities in all parts of the world. It has nothing to do with politics. It has none too much business. The United States has no control over education in the States. There is some satisfaction about that. It is nice to have the United States say "please" to us, when we find our poor hands in the mouth of the federal lion so often. But the United States must look after schools in the territories and the dependencies. The Bureau of Education is its natural instrument. I am skeptical about leaving educational administration wholly to insular commissions. The time may come when there will be a motive for political meddling with the appointment and the salaries of teachers. We have a long, delicate, heavy task before us if we are to make a comprehensive and an enduring school system in our island possessions which is ever to be capable of getting up power enough to run under its own steam. The best administrative organization, adaptable courses of instruction pedagogically arranged, continuity and steadiness of operation, the fullest training and supervision of teachers, freedom from partizanship, and an earlier and closer intimacy with the educational work of the world will be assured if the management of it is imposed upon the United States Bureau of Education.

The enlightenment of a people can not be wholly left to government. There are many things desirable in education which the state can not do. A good public school must be embellished and enriched by the things which an interested constituency will do for it. Private schools should always be the welcome associates of public schools. Wherever there is a school there must be a church. And no matter how many schools or churches are established they must be accompanied by voluntary evangelistic work.

In a word, religion is education. Churches and ministers have quite as much to do with the development of the Philippine Islands as have schools and teachers.

This brings us to a subject of prime importance which is so involved as to make the wisest hesitate. Yet it seems to me that it claims the attention of the conference. It can not be ignored because it is difficult. With much interest in it, I have no right to have any very confident opinion about it.

The facts seem to be that for centuries so much of the islands as was Christian was Roman Catholic. No other Christian denomination was there. This church was there in great strength and efficiency. Its system and ceremonies were suited to the people. Millions adhered to it. It was mixed up with an unworthy movement. The mixing of church control with a good government is bad ; with a bad government it is vicious and unthinkable. History repeated itself. The priesthood became widely corrupted. Imposition and outrage followed. This was met by pretty nearly successful revolution. When we set up a government that could govern, our troops released hundreds of priests from prison. The situation attracted the attention of the world and aroused the resentment and reformatory action of the authorities of the Roman Catholic church. Clarified and reinvigorated, its religious reign is again very firmly established, not only in the towns but wherever in the wilderness its priests can go. Its mission work is aggressive and apparently much better than any other that is there. It quickly engages the devotion of a people to whom its solemn ceremonies, its beliefs, and its administrative methods are especially adapted.

We have happily invented a political system in this country which enables us to live together in reasonable peace notwithstanding our many religious denominations. Our fathers in the old countries, or even in this country in the pioneer days, would not and could not do so well. They were a simpler people with a simpler faith and did not need so many sects to accommodate their theological differences. But they stood ready to fight, and did fight, for what they thought. We have learned that it is not worth while and that others have the right to think and pray as they please. Can we expect more of our primitive peoples in other lands than it was possible for our own fathers to have done? Our Protestant denominations are assuming to contest the ground, but in comparison with the work of the Roman Catholic church their progress is not a delight to us. It seems to be the fact that the Protestant denominations have agreed upon some division of

territory so as to avoid conflicts with one another so far as may be, but there is no possibility of avoiding rivalry with the Church of Rome in any part of our insular territory. I can not help wondering if it is worth while. The people of the Philippine Islands will hardly need variety of sects to accommodate their theological thinking for a long time. If they ever need them they will know how to have them. Denominations will multiply in the natural order of things as fast as they are needed. There is special reason why any missionary work which assumes to express the American spirit and any churches which come to represent the attitude and strength of the Protestant churches in the Philippine Islands shall do it thoroughly and adequately. I have none but Puritan blood in my veins, but I no longer fear that any church will subvert American political institutions. I think that the Roman Catholic church will become more thoroughly adaptable to American political institutions by giving it American confidence. No one can doubt its spirituality or its patriotism. I am in favor of Protestantism wherever it can be self-sustaining, and am in favor of all denominations where the thinking of the people calls for them, but I do not fear to express my misgivings about the wisdom of the policy which forces sectarianism upon an unlettered people, which taxes weak churches in America to support weak churches in our island possessions, with no prospect of those churches becoming self-supporting, while one strong church is on the ground, continues to occupy it forcefully, and is evidently adapted to the situation.

But we are not to rely exclusively upon either schools or churches. They are quite as often the product as the producers of civilizations. What poor people want is more money and capacity to find the point of equipoise between keeping and using it. If the money does not develop the capacity, nothing ever will. Quite as much depends upon new forms of native industry, or better opportunities for expanding such as they now have in the islands, as upon any other one thing. We can not say too often that work is the tonic for physical, mental, and moral health. Work brings money as well as health. The love of money may be the root of all evil, but money itself is the cause of much good. It buys everything. It is clearly understood. It gives every live man a motive. Motives work wonders. Idle people will often bestir themselves if a motive is in sight. It is hard for unlettered and isolated people to put their labor into channels which will bring returns. They can not get their resources into goods and their goods into

markets. They need help, and such help is very potential. People are imitative. If a man raises a crop or makes an article that sells for money, his neighbors go about it. Out of the wits and the money which result from their work they make better homes and then they put their heads and their means together and create institutions.

These islands are likely to have rich possessions of precious metals. They are not without precious stones. They certainly have very considerable agricultural potentiality. They have many woods of great strength which take a beautiful dressing and might find ready markets in America at a time when our native woods are becoming scarce and our markets are seeking novelties. Their mechanics seem exceedingly crude but the people appear teachable and evidently have their share of mechanical gift. They certainly make some very delicate lace and relatively large quantities of very beautiful textile fabrics. The men in their prisons make very satisfactory household furnishings, and the men who are not in the prisons ought to be able to do so. There seems to be no limit to the islands' industrial possibilities. What they need is inspiration and incentive.

So far as our law assumes to affect trade, it should favor these people. So far as we make tariffs to regulate the prices of commodities, they should be helpful to insular trade. At no point of competition should any advantage be given to interests which are no longer in their infancy and are quite able to take care of themselves without the protection of the giant arm of the state. Capital should be encouraged to venture in the industrial development of the islands. Everything should be done to open them up to the people of this country. This involves federal legislation. The sentiment of the country is filled with generosity to our wards, and Congress should adequately and always express it. The implications need not be taken too seriously. Congress has been doing very well of late. No matter who or what has caused it. We tender it the expression of our respectful consideration, in the hope of other favors yet to come.

We shall be together but three brief days. Let us lose no time in getting into the heart of the business that has brought us here. Let us get at the facts. Let us go into whatever we may think of that bears upon the facts; and when discussion shall have brought our minds together let us declare, with all boldness, what we think.

The Lake Mohonk Conferences carry no sword. They have

no compulsory process, no police, or sheriff, or national guard, or regular army. But let no one fear that they are without force. They have helped the Indians: they will help them more. They will help the Filipinos, and the Hawaiians, and the Porto Ricans, and perhaps the Cubans. They have enriched the quality of white civilization by helping it to be both just and generous to red men, and brown men, and yellow men, and black men. They have gathered up, quickened, and declared that public opinion which, as Talleyrand said, is more powerful than any monarch that ever lived. They have rendered a distinct service to democratic institutions and to the sovereignty of the United States, for they have helped them to be beneficent as well as powerful, and thereby show their right to be.

CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS AT CORRESPONDING CONFERENCE

OCTOBER 23, 1907

Mr Smiley and Ladies and Gentlemen: Year after year, twenty-five times, the keen interest which the proprietor of this estate has had in all unfortunate men and women has brought this conference to its gracious hospitality in order to promote the good of the American Indians. Since the war with Spain for the rescue of Cuba the discussions of the conference have extended to the millions of people who came under the sovereignty of the United States as the result of that conflict.

At one of our sittings we shall hear from the secretary of the United States Board of Indian Commissioners about the influence of these twenty-five meetings in stirring Indian sentiment, shaping Indian legislation, and reforming Indian administration. Following my brief introductory words we shall have from Mr Francis E. Leupp, the altogether admirable United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs, some of the interesting details of Indian progress under the better laws and better administration which, it is not too much to say, have largely resulted from the discussions under this roof. And now, and in each succeeding year, we shall expect to hear from officers, agents, teachers, missionaries, and other workers in the Indian service, about the difficulties they encounter and the work they are doing. We shall at all times be anxious to give attention, sympathy, and encouragement to all such and to make any

declarations to the public which may serve substantial ends. But it seems as though the Indian problem has been practically solved so far as general policies are concerned, that it is now almost wholly a matter of administration, and that we may well begin to make the people of our new dependencies the subject of our most serious discussions and of our aggressive declarations.

The Philippine problem has come to be the problem of pressing concern to us. There are more people in the Philippine Islands than in the State of New York—perhaps twenty times more than the Indian population ever was. The conditions are hard and the outlook uncertain. It is a hard matter to have such a mass of unlettered, semisavage, or wholly savage people under our flag, without the possibility of assimilating them as we do the millions who come to us from other lands, and with some inevitable doubts about their ever being able to govern themselves. We are coming to the serious stages of the undertaking and the problem looms even larger than at first. The sober second thought sees that the practical difficulties are heavier, that the moral responsibilities are higher, and that the possibility of substantial results in world progress are more open and unique than at first appeared. It sees also that the reflex influence upon the people and the international standing of the United States, as well as upon world respect for popular government and the coming course of world events, is to be much greater than was at first realized.

It seems to me idle to discuss whether we made a mistake in getting the Philippine Islands upon our hands. They *are* upon our hands. Time spent in wondering whether we ought not to back out of the responsibility, or ought not to sell them, or barter them, or give them away, is time worse than wasted. Aside from that practically universal national pride which will never, without convincing reasons, relinquish any territory that has once come under the sovereignty of the United States, there is a national conscience among us which has some concern about the good faith of governments, and will not give over to utter hopelessness, or abandon to any nation less disposed and less able to promote their best good than ourselves, any dependent people for whom we have once assumed responsibility. And there is no other nation better able to bear the burden, and more unselfishly disposed to do so, than we are.

Nor will the people of the United States seek an arrangement with the great powers by which the Philippine Islands may, like Switzerland, become neutral territory and left to themselves. When

the clear majority of the Filipinos show the capacity for building institutions which the clear majority of the Swiss have long possessed, the suggestion will not be repugnant to our sensibilities, but there will then be no point in it.

There is but one thing to do, and that is to turn a deaf ear to the waverers and go right ahead with the load which we have taken upon ourselves. And we will do it better if we know that we shall not get any shillings for carrying it, and that the road is likely to be so long that none of this generation is likely to see the end of it.

Of the spirit and the acts of the executive officers of the government, so far as I know, there can be no words but those of commendation. McKinley started nobly when he said, "The Philippines are ours, not to exploit, but to develop, to civilize, to educate, to train in the science of self-government. This is the path of duty which we must follow or be recreant to a great trust. The question is not, will it pay, but, will we do what is right?" He acted up to what he said. President Roosevelt has been in entire and enthusiastic accord with the ideal attitudes of his lamented predecessor. What Roosevelt has said has been admirably said and when he induced McKinley's Governor General of the Philippines to become the head of the War Department, because through the military occupancy that department had come to be charged with Philippine administration, and he could thereby bring to his own council table and into the position of largest influence upon Philippine affairs the man best informed and most trusted upon those affairs, he did quite as much as he could do in any way to promote the realization of McKinley's and the country's best hopes.

The information which we get about Philippine matters comes through the officers of the army and navy, through missionaries and teachers, and through occasional travelers. In its parts it is tinged by inevitable bias. As a whole it is often confusing and conflicting. Sometimes a poor little fact is dressed up in such literary clothes to get it into the society of the magazines that it must be wholly unable to recognize itself. The government reports are ponderous, unsystematic, lacking in continuity, poorly indexed if indexed at all, and therefore not very helpful even to one seeking information: to the masses they are inexplicable.

The following essential facts are much condensed from a recent article, having the earmarks of reliability, in the *New York Tribune*. Under Spanish rule the Filipino had nothing to say about government, either local or general. If he went to church it was to one

ruled by the State, and often corruptly. Under American rule the municipal officers are elected, by the people, and the provincial officers are so elected, except the Governor, who is chosen by the municipal councils who are themselves elected by the people, and the Treasurer, who is appointed by the Governor General. The people have just elected a popular assembly which, with the commission appointed by the President of the United States, will constitute a congress for the islands. The justices of the peace, more than half of the circuit judges, and three out of seven justices of the Supreme Court are natives. So is the Attorney General and practically all of the states' attorneys. There is a native police of 6000 men, many of whose officers are natives. The law and the judicial system assure practically every right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. Churches are encouraged by government, but are neither supported by nor under the control of the state. Under Spanish rule it is said there were 200,000 children enrolled in some kind of schools, and that the average daily attendance was half that number. Now there are 500,000 enrolled, with an average attendance of 270,000, in much better schools. The general government is spending \$2,400,000 per annum for schools besides what is expended by provincial and municipal governments. The government maintains 200 pupils in the schools of the United States. The exports and imports have increased something like 50 or 60 per cent. In eight years the public improvements,—buildings, harbor improvements, lighthouses, roads and bridges, and vessels for public service,—have aggregated something like \$20,000,000. The harbor of Manila is said to be the best in the Orient. Under government encouragement, but hedged about by safeguards, there have been constructed sixty miles of electric road and a good lighting system at Manila, and in the same way the railway mileage in operation in the islands has risen from 120 to 205 miles, and 709 miles of new road are in process of construction.

If these statements are true, they certainly form the outlines of a picture which is both heroic and heartening. It is none the less so because not conclusive of the whole matter, or because many of the details of the picture are not up to the expectations of some who are not experienced in such undertakings. Of course the whole subject, outlines and details, needs informing and patriotic discussion. There are many in the country, no doubt there are some here,

who are skeptical about one phase or another of our policies in the Philippines. Certain kinds of skepticism are often healthy. This is a good place for such as you to express doubts, because one may have them taken out of him and another may make a valuable contribution to the judgment of all.

Aside from the training of Filipinos in religion and morals, which is outside of the government functions and accepted by the religious denominations, and which will naturally have the thought of the conference, there are three phases of government policy in the Philippines which suggest themselves to me as deserving our discussion. These relate to political privileges, to secular education, and to industries.

As to giving political privileges, we are, for obvious reasons, disposed to go much further than other great nations who have had to deal with similar questions. Perhaps we may be disposed to go too far. These people are not like our fathers before the American Revolution. There may be a golden mean between the extremes. Political privileges already conferred are sufficient proof of the desire to give all that may be safely exercised; and if the fact that less than two per cent of the population voted at the recent and first general election for a popular assembly, and that those who did were clamorous for independence without appreciating its responsibilities, is not wholly discouraging, it certainly admonishes us to hesitate about going further at once or about making promises. It is manifest enough that for a long time self-government must be very local and simple, and that the possibility of the safe exercise of sovereignty by the islands at an early day is quite out of the question.

The adaptation of schools to the needs of the situation is likely to be a much more difficult matter than many would at once suppose. American schools may not be of the most service to an Un-American people, and certainly Filipino schools can not be locally supported and administered to the extent that American schools are. Quite as certainly, the greatest weakness which we are coming to realize in our American system will count even more heavily against them than us. While we are bound to hold out to every one his equal chance, we will do well if we encourage young Filipinos to be *workmen* rather than lawyers, and doctors, and engineers, and promoters of enterprises, and managers of other Filipinos. There will be enough

who will get into the professional employments and the managing positions without our telling them that they will come short of their deserts and miss their opportunities if they do not. Universal attendance within fixed ages and an exact elementary training ought to be made the fundamental factors in the Filipino schools. We may learn much from our near neighbor in the East, Japan, about this.

Filipino industries claim the best attention of the government. No people can have a life worth the having unless they have some understanding of the economic, moral, and social value of work. And hardly can any people be expected to have such an understanding unless work makes money and is convertible into what money will buy. The industrial problem in the Philippine Islands must, very likely, be always and necessarily a difficult one. It has been doubly so by reason of exceptional occurrences since they came under our sovereignty. If there is to be any American aid to Filipino industries, congressional legislation must open the way for and not hinder it. Federal officers must be led to concentrate their study upon the subject, and, having done so, they must be expected to take definite public attitudes, and, having done this, they must be listened to. The simple industries which will contribute to better living must be encouraged through better implements and improved methods. And other industries which will find or develop markets must be studiously ascertained and methodically introduced by government action and, if need be, by liberal government aid. The amount of money we spend in the matter is of little account so long as it is honestly expended and really leads to self-supporting industries. We are not in this business for commercial gain, and unless there is moral gain we ourselves shall be disgraced, if not debauched, by it. A tariff against insular products for the real purpose of affording superior profits to home industries that are no longer in their infancy is abhorrent to the good conscience and overwhelming opinion of the American people. The Philippine industries are now "home industries" quite as much as any other industries and the circumstances claim for them not only equal terms but any preference which their existence and reasonable prosperity may require. There are some people who do not see things which they do not want to see unless they are told in particular ways. If party managers who control these things continue to turn a deaf ear to the gentle voices

which are now protesting, they will find that many objectors will join forces and they will hear from enough people in a way that will be entirely intelligible to them. Not only the revenue tariffs but every other instrumentality of the general government is expected to be used in uplifting the people of the Philippine Islands. McKinley's thought must be carried out. The members of Congress talk most entertainingly, and no doubt genuinely; but congressional action is often so very different from the congressmen whom we know. There is the rub. The Washington departments and both houses of Congress, as to everything but the coming elections, have come to be the most easily resistive machines in all history.

For myself alone, I have doubt about making the War Department the essential and permanent Washington instrument of insular administration, and it is not relieved even by the qualities and the experiences of Secretary Taft. It was natural enough at the beginning because it was then military administration almost exclusively. Perhaps it was well. Possibly it saved us from purely partizan administration. The military service, as President Eliot points out, is one for protection and not instruction, and it seems as though the essential work we are to do in the Philippines will be more quickly done without any unnecessary control by the military establishment.

We do not overlook little Porto Rico, or our good friends in the Hawaiian Islands. The problem with them is by no means so large. Before the conference is over you will doubtless know that the Hawaiian people are abundantly able to speak for themselves. And both of these peoples will quickly get the benefit of any insular policies which the overwhelming situation in the Philippines may induce.

In a concluding word, the millions of Filipinos who have come under our care will move out of the darkness and into the light more quickly when it is fully realized that whether they do it or not depends alike upon themselves and upon the people of the United States; that the process is essentially a moral one and the task upon us is one of the world burdens which our own advance has brought to us; that legislation which is not framed upon altruistic lines will not serve any good purpose for them or for us; that efficient administration must have very special reference to the things to be done, and expert opinion must have the respect and the influence which belong to it; and that over all there must be definite, responsive and reachable accountability. And there is reason enough



to question whether it is not desirable that there be an independent office at Washington which will have specific and pretty independent charge of insular affairs, which will have power to do things and the right to be listened to, which will be charged with full knowledge about dependencies in general and the Philippines in particular, and which will not only be established upon a legal footing that will enable it to be independent of all meanness if it is willing to be, but, above all else, will be under the direct influence of the better spirit of the American people.

WHAT NEXT ABOUT UNION UNIVERSITY?

ADDRESS BEFORE UNION UNIVERSITY AT ODDFELLOW'S HALL, ALBANY,
ON UNION UNIVERSITY DAY, MARCH 7, 1907

Mr Chancellor:

I rise to make this address with something more in mind than the official obligation which requires that I be interested in all colleges and do what I may to extend all learning. The history of this old college and of these professional schools associated in Union University — of one of which I am myself a graduate,— the marks which these institutions have already made upon the intellectual and particularly the professional development of the country, the fact that in a special sense they are the institutions of my home people, and an understanding resulting from my later year experiences of what these institutions deserve and of what the future of this people demands, fill me not only with a warm appreciation of your courtesy but also make me sensible of considerable temerity in accepting it.

There are not many colleges in America which date back to the eighteenth century and those which do are to be held in special honor. Union College is one of them. In 1779 petitions signed by a thousand citizens of Albany, Tryon and Charlotte counties were presented to the Governor and Legislature in these words:

“Whereas a great number of respectable inhabitants of the counties of Albany, Tryon (Montgomery), and Charlotte (Washington), taking into consideration the great benefit of a good education, the disadvantages they labor under for want of the means of acquiring it, and the loud call there now is, and no doubt will be in a future day, for men of learning to fill the several offices of church and state; and looking upon the town of Schenectady as in every respect the most suitable and commodious seat for a seminary of learning in this State, or perhaps in America, have presented their humble petition to the Governor and Legislature of this State, earnestly requesting that a number of gentlemen may be incorporated in a body politic who shall be empowered to erect an academy or college in the place aforesaid, to hold sufficient funds for its support, to make proper laws for its government, and to confer degrees.”

While it was proposed to call the college Clinton College after the doughty old warrior and statesman who was the first governor of a state which was then only a year old there is no doubt whatever about this being the germ which sixteen years later took corporate form in Union College.

Let us recall how far away that movement was and the stirring condition in which it developed. But twenty-five years before, the first convention to consider the matter of forming a colonial confederacy with twenty-five delegates representing seven colonies, with a resulting plan of union that was rejected by the King because it was too democratic and by the colonies because it was too autocratic, had met in this city. Some of the same men were in both movements. Only three years before independence had been declared and only a year before the state government had been organized. It was upon the same ground and close upon the heels of the most comprehensive, strategic, and disastrous campaign of the British in the Revolution. Sir Henry Clinton from the lower Hudson, St Leger from across Lake Ontario and through the valley of the Mohawk, and Burgoyne from the St Lawrence, along Lake Champlain and the upper Hudson, had undertaken to join forces right here and end revolution in America. General Schuyler, who instead of Gates was entitled of right to receive the sword of Burgoyne, was the best friend and the largest contributor to the movement for the new college and the very people who had had most to do with turning Clinton back to the sea, with dispersing St Leger's regulars, Canadians, and Indians at Oriskany, and with capturing the entire army of Britain's most arrogant general at Saratoga, were the supporters of it. They had cleared the ground and opened the way for it. 1779 was the year of Wayne's brilliant feat of arms at Stony Point. It was the year of John Paul Jones and the Bon Homme Richard. It was the year of Sullivan's sanguinary campaign against the Indians in the Wyoming valley, and it was the year in which George Rogers Clark, with a little army that made up in daring what it lacked in numbers, appeared at the old fort at Kaskaskia on the upper Mississippi in the midst of a night's revelry and gallantly told the British officers and their ladies that they could go on with the dance but it would be well for them to know that from that point it would be under the Virginian and not the English flag.

The ground upon which Union College was planted was still a dangerous frontier. There was hardly a border line between it and the subtle and savage Iroquois. Schenectady was then and

for thirty years later a part of the county of Albany. Tryon was the present county of Montgomery with the territory to the west and south, and Charlotte was what is now the county of Washington and beyond. There was or had been but one college in New York territory, and that had been suspended by the war. The idea clearly was to establish a college for the "Northern and Western Counties" in anticipation of the development of the State to the westward and at a point which would in time become central. New England emigration was even then setting towards the Susquehanna and even the Genesee countries. The rising tide of state and national life was beginning to run strongly and the time was confidently expected when the seat of the college would be near the center of an opulent and imperial state.

The State was then so young and unversed in the new political theory that no one seems to have been very clear about the methods of exercising the authority of the commonwealth in the creation of a college. It seems reasonable to believe that the movement for the new college, deferred from obvious necessity, led to the careful consideration and — five years later and as soon as independent statehood and nationality were officially declared — to the creation of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York, with power to charter and supervise schools and colleges.

In the petition to the Board of Regents in 1795, which resulted in the charter for the college, mention is made of another petition for the college at Schenectady, signed by 1200 of the people living on the border land of civilization, and presented to the Legislature in session at Kingston in 1782. The entire population of Schenectady by the State Census fourteen years later was less than 3500, but few as they were the inhabitants of the town proposed to give the college something like £8000 sterling. Not much more is known of this phase of the movement.

In 1785 the citizens of Schenectady by mutual agreement established a private academy in their midst, which was the real organized beginning of Union College.

In 1791 the managers of the academy appealed to the Legislature for a grant of land in the Oneida Indian Reservation in order to get the means which would support their application to the Regents for incorporation of a college. But the obdurate Legislature apparently thought that the Indians might have rights above those of the proposed college to those lands.

In 1792 the managers of the academy prayed the Regents for a

college charter, admitting that they lacked necessary funds but asserting that the endowment was promised but could not be made over until there was a corporation which was legally competent to hold the same. The Regents were unable to locate a particular moment when the essential conditions precedent to the granting of a charter would present themselves under that plan with sufficient clearness to permit of their granting the request according to law. It was another case of Lincoln's Mississippi steamboat which had such a large whistle and such a small boiler that if it whistled it couldn't run and if it ran it couldn't whistle. New York under its Board of Regents has uniformly been much more exacting than any other state about requiring the means with which to maintain a college before giving it corporate life. Although the Regents had never yet had the pleasure of chartering a college they were skeptical and heroic enough to refuse the application. But the next year they did charter the private academy as a public academy of the State. Yet again, early in 1794, the Regents refused an application for a charter because of the "low state of literature and of funds in the institution." It is not to be inferred that they were unsympathetic or disinclined, and as several of the earliest and strongest friends of the proposed college were members of the Board of Regents it is quite apparent that they were ingeniously predisposed, to aid the enterprise more wisely than by prematurely granting a charter. In the next year, 1795, the charter was granted by the Board.

The year 1795 was a year of considerable educational import in the affairs of New York. It was the year in which the Legislature of this State passed the first American statute making a liberal appropriation for the development of a State system of common schools and requiring all districts to raise amounts equal to their distributive shares. And the coincidence between this act and the chartering of the college was followed by another, ten years later, when an act for the liberal support of the college by the State and the act for establishing the State common school fund went through the Legislature together.

All the prominent men of the State were in the movement. The names of Van Rensselaer, Oothout, Romeyn, Schuyler, Clinton, Ten Eyck, Van Slyck, Van Dyck, Schermerhorn, Vedder, Yates, Ten Broeck, Duane, Saunders, Wyckoff, Vrooman, Fonda, Banyar, Vlecker, DeWitt, Taylor, DeGraff, and many others are conspicuous.

The distinguishing marks of this movement deserve attention.

At a meeting of the trustees of the academy, which was a forerunner of the college in the wilderness, held in 1794, it was resolved "that public utility, liberality of sentiment, and *entire exclusion of all party whatsoever* ought to be attended in forming a plan for a college." And at a later meeting held by these trustees with a "number of gentlemen of information in the city of Albany" in furtherance of the project, it was resolved that "A majority of the board of trustees shall never be composed of persons of any one particular religious denomination" and that "No president or professor of the college, being a minister of the gospel, shall take upon himself or hold the pastoral charge of any church or congregation." The charter itself provided that no law or rule of the college "should exclude any person of any religious denomination whatever from equal liberty and advantage of education, or from any of the degrees, liberties, privileges, benefits or amenities of the said college on account of his particular tenets of religion." I am not laying any implication against the denominational college. I am only pointing out that there was a college with new and distinguishing attributes in America. Twelve colleges had already come to considerable repute in America but none of them had provided for religious differences and the training of all the men of a state who should go to college, which was the ideal at which this movement aimed. Indeed, the word "Union" did not refer to the "more perfect union" of the states which had been accomplished in the federal Constitution but six years before, as might be supposed, but to the union of all parties and religious sects in an up-state movement for the higher learning.

The predominant thought in the establishment of Union College clearly was that it should not be denominational, but quite as much that it should not be private, local or exclusive in any other sense. It came as near being the State college as the obscure educational and democratic outlook of the times would permit. The charter was signed by George Clinton as Chancellor, and DeWitt Clinton as Secretary of the Regents of the University. Of the twenty-three original trustees of the college, seven resided in Albany, six in Schenectady, three in Ballston, and in Saratoga, Troy, Kinderhook, Palatine, Herkimer, and Whitestown, N. Y., and Hackensack, N. J., one each. In 1806 the number was reduced to twenty-one and the Chancellor and justices of the Supreme Court of the State and all the elective state officers were added. Once the State provided funds for it upon condition that the

Regents should thereafter appoint the trustees, and the college wisely accepted the condition. Amendments to the State Constitution have twice worked changes in the State officers who are *ex officio* trustees of the college, but in a hundred years the college has never been without them. The *ex officio* trustees are now the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Secretary of State, Comptroller and Treasurer.

The students were widely distributed. The register of graduates of the first half century at the semicentennial anniversary in 1845 contains the names of 398 graduates of whom but 38 were residents of Schenectady.

But there was even more than this to give the first college chartered by the State the flavor and attributes of a state college. In his jubilant letter to Dr Romeyn announcing the granting of the charter, General Schuyler authorized the trustees to put him down for another hundred pounds, and added, "I shall strive to procure a donation on the part of this State and as I have already conversed with some leading members on the subject I trust my efforts will be successful." They were. Schuyler was not only a soldier idol, but he was also a man of wealth, of social distinction and of conspicuous political sagacity and influence. He had a large estate in lands and had carried on a vast mercantile business. His wife was a Van Rensselaer, and his daughter was the wife of Hamilton. He had been one of the first two United States senators chosen by the State; he was now a member of the State Senate and of the Board of Regents, and before his frail body was to find rest in our Rural cemetery he was again to go to the federal Senate. There was reason enough why the energy of such a man should bring State aid to the college. It did. In 1795 the Legislature granted \$3750, in 1796 \$10,000, in 1797 \$1500. In 1805, \$45,000 was derived from lotteries authorized by the State, which were then held proper enough, and following an act of the Legislature in 1814 some \$300,000 was received in the same way.

Here was a college coming rapidly into the full estate of a state college. It was the offspring of the freest democracy of the times. There was no exclusiveness about it. Its doors swung to the masses. It was accepted by the people of the State. The State was not only aiding it but was giving money for the particular purpose of meeting the expenses of poor students. The old idea that a college is to come down from above and is to be the exclusive instrument of wealth, was just beginning to be shaken with the knowledge that a college can be pushed up from below, can

be born of political power as well as of wealth, and can become the efficient instrument of the masses. The idea of a state college was not new and it was not peculiar to New York. It was the logical outworking of democracy and nationality. It resulted, in considerable measure, from the French influence in our affairs. It was incubating and perhaps hatching in other states. It brought the able and the wealthy into cooperation with the poor for the common good and therefore the good of both. It was leading right on to public and common proprietorship in the instruments of the deepest learning, the very thing which experience was to prove necessary in American democracy, when something happened to throw it all over for many years if not forever.

In 1823 gossip began to busy herself about the funds of Union College much of which had been provided by the State, and the next year the Board of Regents made a decidedly formal and peremptory demand for a complete and specific accounting. The trustees denied the legal power of the Regents over any of their financial affairs. A great rumpus followed. The Legislature was in the midst of it. Most of the able men of the State had intellectual dissipation in it. It was four years after the Dartmouth College case in the United States Supreme Court and the controversy ranged over much of the same ground. Losing sight of how much State money the college had had and what had become of it, forgetting all about what the college needed and the obligations of the State to it, forgetting the realities and magnifying the mere artificialities of the common life, the resolves and arguments and counter arguments dealt with officialism and prerogatives, with constitutional intendments and limitations, with legislative powers and purposes, with charter rights and the functions of common law visitors, and with divers other legal subtleties about which the great lawyers plume themselves. The broadaxes and the rapiers and some of the stiletos got into action. The legal reasoning was logical and skilful and it was embellished with innuendo, implication, invective and sarcasm, covered a little with the polite, insincere phrases of which many of the great lawyers of other days came to be past masters. Barring their infernal length and miserable print, the papers are a sort of literary and legal treat even now. The Legislature took refuge in referring them to the Attorney General, and adjourning. The Attorney General at the next session presented an able opinion in favor of the Regents. Then the judges that had been and were, wrote

elaborate opinions which had singular oneness of conclusion in favor of the trustees of the college.

The college had apparently the better of the legal argument. Nothing escaped its able and distinguished advisers and every point was pressed clear home with all there was of legal learning and aggressiveness. But it established, as it seems to me, more than it was well to establish. It won a famous victory, and lost its finest opportunity. It established its independence not only of the Regents, but of the Legislature and of the State, and abandoned the strategic advantage which was easily within its reach. No more State money was ever appropriated to it.

It is quite apparent that there was no ground for questioning the integrity of the trustees. They had been passing through a very hard time. It was a time for both dignity and conciliation. Their course illustrates the frequent unwisdom of standing upon the outer edge of legal rights. Regardless of technical legal rights, they should have reported about the State moneys to any one who would do them the favor of taking the information. When a question was raised about the integrity of the college management they should have stood in State street or upon the sand road and put a complete explanation in the hand of every passer-by. They and the Regents should have adjusted their differences in the interest of further moral and financial support for Union College and the interests for which it stood. They should have said, "We will meet every demand within our power if you will keep the appropriations abreast of the demands."

Dartmouth College had just been prevented from becoming a state college by the reasoning of Webster and the determination of Marshall, and Union College after having become a state college in everything but name now abdicated the position for exactly the same reasons which prevailed in the Dartmouth case. The vital one was unwillingness to submit to any measure of state control. In the words of Mr Carlyle the "constitutions had not marched" then as they have since and the educational purpose of our free democracy had not had its development, if, indeed, it had had its birth.

I am not rash enough to infringe upon the exclusive rights of the sons of Union to deal with the struggles and triumphs and setbacks, the pranks and escapes and punishments, the loves and inspirations and idealities of the life of Union College. It is not necessary to go behind the record to find incidents which must have made the clouds thick and murky upon college hill, and

other incidents which must have disposed the greatest of presidents to dance a hornpipe with the smallest of freshmen. They are to be reserved to the men who have the motive and the right to make them larger and rosier with each new telling. But there is one great factor in that life which is common property for it became a moral and intellectual asset of the nation. You anticipate me for you know I refer to the great qualities and the unparalleled presidency of Eliphalet Nott.

Governor Seward wrote, on the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the college, "I, too, am proud to be an alumnus of Union and a pupil of Nott," and Francis Wayland, himself a great college president, began the main address at the fiftieth anniversary of Dr Nott's presidency by saying "The reason of my appearing before you may be briefly told. The man whom every graduate of Union loves as a friend and venerates as a parent thought proper to request me to perform this service." And the many other men, some of them great men, whose souls responded to the same sentiments, could hardly be counted.

Nott's presidency extended through sixty-two years. But that is the least of it. His scholarship was deep and broad, both practical and classical. His generosity was unstinted and his sagacity matchless. He was a ready and forceful writer and so graceful in public speech as to become "The old man eloquent" of the college and the State. His piety was so pure and childlike as to save an undenominational college of fifty years ago from the charge of irreligion. The larger part of his administration was turbulent. Criticism was rife and it was not without occasion. He mingled college moneys with his own and commonly acted alone in the investment of the college funds and the management of the college business. If we know well enough that it was all wrong, there were few precedents then, the needs were imperative, and the boundless energy and devotion of the man led to results which could be gained in no other way. Criticism and implication were happily withdrawn at the end in the presence of the fact that all that he had, and it was quite a half million, went to the college. In the closing years of his great life his able, intellectual sons laid bare all the facts which a proud and honest spirit had refused to disclose, and wove together the indubitable proofs which convinced the world that his honor was as untarnished as his efficiency was brilliant and unquestioned.

In this great career there were at least three factors which were the forerunners of a new type of college president and the makers

of a new kind of college in America. He had considerable mechanical gift and was predisposed toward invention. If it led at times to catastrophe and humiliation, it took dogmatism and catechism out of his teaching and quickened it with illustration, demonstration and live human interest. He did more than any other of his generation to break out the roads towards the laboratory methods in all branches and grades of instruction. He did what he could, and it was much, for better methods of teaching which have now come to be universally accepted. Beyond that, he actually liked real boys and, for a college president of his day, he was surprisingly bold in letting them know it. He did not overestimate the power of boys who are worth being reckoned with to absorb the abstractions of dogmatic theology, and he learned in the first year of his presidency that a college faculty is liable to be about the worst tribunal that was ever devised for dealing with a college boy in a scrape. The graduation examination was more to him than the entrance examination, and the power of a man to do the work was the evidence he wanted of the man's right to the opportunity to do it. Yet again, he had a conception of the democratic mission of the American college, of the differing kinds of work which it ought to do, of the differing classes of people which it ought to serve, and of the multifarious interests it was bound to promote, which had not obtained at any other seat of learning in America at that time. Putting all this with the qualities of the student who would be attracted by it, we may see something of the reason why so large a percentage of the early sons of Union College came to places of much conspicuity in the world. The students were resourceful, the management was paternal, the offerings were diverse, the instruction was adaptable, and the inspirations were for ends which ordinary young men might hope to gain. No one familiar with educational history can fail to see that here was a substantial breaking away from the aristocracy and exclusiveness, as well as the offerings, the methods, and the outlook of the English universities and their undeveloped prototypes in America. If it is too much to say that this breaking away was for a long time exclusively at Union, it is not too much to say that it was unprecedentedly, emphatically and most potentially there. And it has given irresistible trend to collegiate thinking and collegiate policies in America. It has done more than that; it has developed the very distinct popular purpose to use the overwhelming political power of the third estate in our Republic to maintain at the common cost higher institutions of learn-

ing quite equal to any that are or are to be in the land. If not so, then this great result is the inevitable outworking of our democratic life, for, no matter whether one wills it or no, he who can not see it is blind to what is going on in the intellectual development of the country.

The private gifts to the higher learning are so large and so many as to paralyze our credulity. What is the end to be? Of one thing we may not doubt. What one can do in this land another will do. What one class or interest can do another class or interest will do. Equality of right and of opportunity is fundamental. It is more thoroughly understood and more rationally believed in now than when the Continental Congress proclaimed it. It extends to intellectual as well as personal, political and property rights. It does not seem hard to see that we are quickly coming to the time when in addition to a good elementary school close by every home and a good secondary school within walking or riding distance of every home, we shall have a great university, with all literary, scientific, technical and professional departments, established either by the money of the millionaire or by the state or the municipality, and free, or practically free, to whomsoever is qualified to do the work, within a hundred miles of every town.

Educational values will be better understood and colleges and universities will be better classified and standardized. Measuring rods will be more exactly applied. The contents of the package will have to be set forth upon the wrapper. The college will have to do a specialized work. It will have to do what it assumes to do and do it as well as other colleges can do it, if it is to have credit and prestige. Colleges will learn, if they have not learned, that there is educational economy through combinations in universities. Patrons will see that there is advantage to students of parts from shuffling with the crowd, and that the aggregate of weaklings who come to naught or go to the bad is no less in the smaller institutions than in the larger ones. In any event, the circumstances of population, of living, of transportation, of the cost of plant, and of the extent of faculty, for the efficiency in higher education have settled the matter. The die is cast. Every considerable community will have a university equal to its demands and pretty nearly free of cost to all who are prepared for its work and will come to take advantage of it. The history of the high school development is to be repeated. Communities that enter into the movement will find the advantage of it in their industrial, scientific, professional, and political life, and few will long be so perverse as

to be willing to lag behind the others. Each will want the best. The old-time theories of the aristocracy will have to go. They are nearly gone now. Fortunes that can find no other proper use, and the inevitable outworking of political power, have already given the trend and set the wheels in motion. Surely it will affect the older institutions. Their constituencies will not in the long run be so widely distributed. The supply of teachers from the older to the newer will turn back from the newer to the older. And the inexorable law of nature which favors the son of toil rather than the illusioned son of wealth will prove its wisdom in the substance and the balance of democratic institutions and their steadily enlarging influence in all of the affairs of our great, round world.

It may seem that I have wandered, but I have kept an end in view. I now bring this old college, with its history and its present situation, into this general field. With all of its history, lapping parts of three centuries, notwithstanding the fact that it was the first college chartered by the State and to all intents was once the State College, and notwithstanding the fact that it was the first college established in America westward of the Hudson river, and with its alumni filling places of honor and trust in every state, it is poor. New conditions and enlarged demands have grown up around it. It has not been able to keep in the lead of events. It has become associated with four institutions in this city in a nominal university. It is an arrangement of mutual convenience. Each of those institutions has, as things go in this country, an ancient, and certainly each has an honorable, history. Would that I could have paid proper tribute to each. But neither has been able to give much of support to another or to the whole. All of these institutions are good, but poor. Each needs an endowment, the assured means of stronger support. In underpinning and superstructure each needs rejuvenation and strengthening. Each of these institutions needs to be put in circumstances which will enable it to give to and get from the others. The college needs to be reinforced and broadened if it is to continue to serve the ends of general culture or provide the training for business and social life, or supply the preparation for the technical and professional schools which they are bound to demand if they are to meet the demands which are coming—have already come, upon all professional schools. And the medical school and the law school and the technological school ought not only to require stronger general and scientific scholarship for admission, and look to the college to provide it, but they must present wider offerings,

longer courses, larger laboratories, fuller equipment, and more teachers whose exclusive work is teaching, in order to do their professional work as well as, or better than, other professional schools are doing it. The association of professional schools with a literary and arts college in a university has been abundantly demonstrated to be highly desirable, and almost or quite a vital one. And of course the value of the whole depends upon the strength of the parts. Not only this but other schools need to be created for their own sake and for the sake of those already here.

Union University has a situation which stirs envy in other institutions. It is close by the capital of the first State in the Union. It is in a half dozen cities of nearly a half million people who, with the new means of transportation, are only a few minutes apart. For higher educational purposes they are really one community. It is close by organized State educational activities like which there are none other in the country. It will soon find itself in the shadow of a great new building, the first in the country to be devoted exclusively to the intellectual interests of a state. It has access to one of the very great libraries of the nation which is soon to be very much greater. It is adjacent to the State Normal College which is about to be housed in a new, spacious and beautiful home, with facilities much expanded in many ways. It is in close association with the oldest school of civil engineering in the country which has just been aided by a worthy woman with a munificent addition to its endowment. It has exceptional opportunities for a great school of electrical, mechanical and sanitary engineering. It has not far to look for a historical and art institute which might easily become the nucleus of a school of fine arts. All around it there are excellent public high schools and good private academies without number. All these institutions need college help, and can give help. It is in an environment which is historic, and ought to be and is able to be a center of education in the country. It is among a people of liberal means, some of whom might be disposed to save the transfer taxes upon the whole or a part of their estates by giving them over to an institution of learning really equal to the higher and diversified educational requirements of a community in which they have keen interest.

In another twenty years there will probably be no city in the United States with a quarter of a million people which will permit itself to suffer the injustice of being without a university which shall provide general culture, specialize in some measure in the fine arts,

propagate the political sciences, supply thorough training for all of the professions and make practical application of the scientific knowledge of the world to all of the agricultural, constructive and manufacturing industries.

In some way these cities and towns about the capital will have such a university. They will have an infinitely better university if they combine their resources and ingenuity. The necessary cost of plant and of operation is so great that either one of these cities would make a profound mistake and surely meet with at least partial failure if it were to attempt to act alone. The logic of the situation, information which we all have, or which is at hand, and institutions of much worth which are already in our midst, point to the fact that these cities should combine in a university movement.

Union College and the professional institutions associated with it can no longer hope to serve a widely distributed constituency. They will have sufficient burden and ample honor if they serve adequately the half million people or more who are within fifty miles of the New York State capital and if they represent these prosperous and intelligent communities as they are entitled to be represented upon the broad field of the higher learning in America.

Now, let us avoid a misfortune by speaking of it. From the first step in the development of Union College there have been occasional movements for installing it at Albany. Because of my absence I know less of the latest of these movements than others do. But I probably risk little in saying that no resident of this city will be disposed to become sponsor for such a suggestion now. The growth and the circumstances of population have already gone some distance and will speedily go much further in making that question of no practical concern. But there will be need of much readjustment and of adapting plans to situations which can be accomplished only by much concession and by readily opening the doors to new men and women, new influences and new movements. It is harder to organize a new scheme where there is a very respectable old one than where there is none at all. And it will be idle to move at all in this matter unless all who are interested are going to be disposed to take the situation as it is and act freely, without bias, prejudice or favor in making the most of it. But I entertain little doubt that if any interest should block the way of such a movement because of selfishness, that interest will find its own ends defeated, by the inevitable outworking of the situation in the next twenty years. For even in ancient

communities, the thing that ought to be in time finds its opportunity and breaks its way through.

I may have admitted, or assumed, or ventured more than the trustees and friends of the institutions in Union University would do. Even so, I have committed none but myself and I know full well that if my words do not generate much new energy they are not likely to produce very much harm. Wholly aside from what has been said it is very earnestly to be hoped that the cities of Albany, Troy, Schenectady, Hudson, Rensselaer, Cohoes and Watervliet and the prosperous villages above and below us upon the Hudson, and towards the Berkshires, up the valley of the Mohawk and out towards the headwaters of the Susquehanna may give their sincere and intelligent attention to the means for providing their people with adequate opportunities for the higher learning. These cities and towns ought to have a real university which they may justly call their own. It should be a university which can engage in all lines of research, be able to respond to every scientific need, and offer competent instruction in all branches of human learning. Its doors should swing freely to both men and women who are deserving, who have completed the work of the secondary schools, and who want to go further. It should nourish the natural, professional, political, and industrial sciences, and conserve, while it enlarges, the intellectual estate of ancient communities and a historic situation. It could be done as economically and yet as potentially here as anywhere in the country. But to do it in any satisfactory measure even here it must have an equipment of buildings and appliances which would be worth five millions of dollars and an endowment of ten millions or an assured and permanent income which would represent such an endowment. If such a university could be developed here it would be a crowning glory to a conspicuous and strategic situation, and if Union College, the Albany Medical College, the Albany Law School, and the Dudley Observatory could become the heart and core of such a university the fact would accord with the eternal fitness of things.

It may be so if all who will it so will join hands to make it so.

Look forward not back; 'tis the chant of creation,
The chime of the seasons as onward they roll:
'Tis the pulse of the world, 'tis the hope of the nation
'Tis the voice of our God in the depths of the soul.

Lend a hand! Like the sun that turns night into morning,
The star that leads storm-driven sailors to land.
Ah, life is worth living with this for the watchword—
Look up, out, and forward, and each lend a hand.

THE SCHOOLS AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE

ADDRESS AT THE LAKE MOHONK CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL
ARBITRATION MAY 23, 1907

Mr President:

As a mere matter of prudence, my admission and your observation of the fact that this is my first appearance at a peace conference may well be coincident.

I am expected to treat of what the schools may do to promote the peace of the world. That involves my understanding of the basis of world peace. If I can not have a confident philosophy about that I can not rationally think of the relations which the schools ought to sustain to it. It is a subject about which there is not a little mystery and not a little divergent philosophy. If the newspapers are correctly informing, even the past masters are not at all times at peace in peace conferences.

Never, since the angels first proclaimed "On earth peace; good will toward men," has the hope of universal peace and good will seemed so assuring. It is because of the outworking of the New Power which the angels then heralded in the affairs of men. But the peace and good will were not to be without heavy conflict. Christ said, "I came not to send peace, but a sword." The sword was to be the necessary forerunner of peace. Repeatedly He foretold the horrors which were to follow the unfolding of the new gospel. Prophecy has been realized in fact. The theology or the spirituality of it I have not the training to exploit. Doubtless some professor of theology will tell us that the obvious meaning is not the real meaning of the statement. The Lord probably had no conception of modern theological interpretation: most assuredly I have none.

I think I have some understanding of the history which has followed since the statement was made and that fixes my attitude of mind. A new king came into human life. True, He was a heavenly king. He regarded not the kings of the earth, but they had to regard Him. He gained followers at once and together they propagated a philosophy and pursued a course which defied monarchs. The monarchs resisted, and harrassed them but they gained great numbers and became a great force. They stirred the thinking as well as the feelings of great peoples. All peoples lived in subjection to kings. The power of the kings was in the

unthinking obedience of their subjects. The only argument was brute force. But conviction and faith could not be abashed by physical force. The new religion was as intellectual as spiritual. Nations were actually set in motion. It widened knowledge and sharpened mentality. Men and women had to think for themselves, and then their thinking was unlike. Creeds began to be framed and the drawing and the defense of them made for logical thinking and trained intellectuality. With added numbers and hardening creeds and deepening faith, and with all this opposed by nothing but brute force, aggression was natural and conflict inevitable. Armies broke out the road over which freedom and the truth could advance to the making of a new order of things.

The crusades did a little something for the central European nations in the early centuries, like what modern invention and travel have been doing in our century. The compounding of a new nation in Britain a thousand years ago did something more. The discovery of America, the consequent Spanish dreams of world empire and the expulsion of Spain from the Netherlands did even more, and the German, and English, and American, and French revolutions — all sequential — did yet more. And the compounding of yet another nation in America, which has practically demonstrated the possibility of secure and aggressive popular government, with the sense of moral right and the political prescience which could locate the point of equipoise between liberty and security, has stridden toward the climax of universal peace more decisively than all before. It has all been associated with intellectual virility and moral advances. Schools and universities and literatures and philosophies and systems of laws and professional spirit and learning, and endless devices and conveniences which are the product of the fact that individualism is having its chance in the world,—all this is the logical unfolding of a mighty plan which was beyond the ordering of men.

It has all been marked by force — the rational and regulated force of the mass controlling the greedy, impulsive, vicious power of the chieftan or the clan. It was impossible without physical force, and the force of the Christian peoples was as righteous as the thinking which called it into operation. Gustavus Adolphus and William of Nassau are as much entitled to the regard of a peace conference as is Luther. Cromwell should be as justly honored here as Stratford and Sir Harry Vane. Washington's army was as moral a force as the Continental Congress, whose Declaration of Independence it made good. Lincoln's armies were

as righteous as the Constitution which required Lincoln to gather such forces as were necessary to execute the laws in all parts of the land. The heroic doings of the men and women who made our free democracy possible and proved its power to govern, and therefore its right to be, are moral assets of the nation and moral stimulants in the schools. The obligation of this generation to impress all this upon the next generation is as binding as the eternal truth itself, and as sacred as a vicarious grave.

Constitutionalism is the corner stone of the peace of the nations, and it will have to be of the peace of the world. It has been expanded through armed resistance to brutal aggression. It has not yet gone so far as to do away completely with the further necessity of force; it has not made the struggles which were the conditions of its birth seem wicked; it has not put a ban upon present and future aggressiveness. What it *has* done has been to define and assure natural rights by subordinating force to law. It has established courts to determine disputes upon principles which have sprung out of the wisdom of the ages, and it has created officers and forces who, in a systematic and authoritative way, bring the physical strength of all good citizens when need be to protect the rights of good and bad.

Some men and some nations want anything but law and anything but the lawful exercise of the common authority against them. Such men in a political society have to be controlled; such nations have to be enlightened. It remains to be seen whether the principle that the constitutional nations are to exercise control over lawless ones is to prevail throughout the world,—and if so, in what cases?

I dissent from any doctrine which would make men insipid. If a felon breaks into my house the law expects me to resist him, and if I think I am in peril—as I will think if I am not unusually stupid—the law approves of my killing him. That is not only because my house is my castle, but to the end that other felons may know what to expect. If I see a brutal and irresponsible scoundrel strike a woman in the street, I am a weak character and a worthless citizen if I do not employ whatever strength I may have to protect her. The law would shield her, and it not only expects all good citizens to aid it but, in the absence of its authorized officers, to execute it as best they can. It required thousands of years to establish in the law the principle that all decent people must stand for the security and the opportunity of each, and each for the good of all. It has now become firmly

established in all well-ordered countries. It will be no small matter to make it a virile and accepted principle governing the conduct and the relations of nations. It was left for democracy to give it its opportunity. The rescue of Cuba from Spain by the United States, not for gain, much against our interest, and only because it was right, has supplied the object lesson which good international teaching needs, and it has exemplified a principle which is vital to world progress.

It is perhaps too much to expect that nations will bind themselves in advance to accept the determinations of an international tribunal. That may be parting with sovereignty,—the one thing that nations can not do. But the very fact of participating in setting up an international tribunal establishes the purpose to respect it. The very fact of submitting a case to it proves the expectation to abide its determination. Nations which take these solemn steps and then repudiate them, without assigning a reason which commends itself to the sense of the world, will forfeit the international respect which is alike vital to the standing and the strength of nations, and without which they are little to be feared.

The nations have come to live so closely together; the news of the world is so widely and quickly known; the mind of the world is so enlightened, the moral sense so strong, the principles of justice so widely and firmly established, and, withal, war has become so mechanical and abhorrent, that it does seem as though there should be sufficient agreement among the more progressive nations to establish some substantial form of constitutional procedure *between* as well as *within* the nations. It at least ought to go so far as to prevent aggressive warfare without just cause, or, even *with* just cause, without imperative need. But I am not prepared to oppose all warfare. The deliberate thought of an enlightened people surely ought to have its way after every other alternative has failed.

I feel bound now to qualify my expressions as to the need of force to uphold law and maintain sovereignty. I do not agree to the endless accretion of idle armament and unusable forces. The educative influence of it is bad; the surplusage of it is exactly opposed to the only legitimate purpose of it.

It would seem that any general and efficient scheme for settling international controversies must depend upon—(a) ripening public sentiment, (b) a permanent court of such exalted character that no people with a just cause would fear its determinations, and

(c) a written and steadily augmenting code of legal principles which ought to govern international conduct, both in peace and war.

The sentiment is crystallizing; the forerunner of the court is already in being and the permanent court seems likely; the code has augmented slowly while its only opportunity was through agreements in treaties or precedents, but it will be more rapidly expanded when there is a place to submit issues and when determinations are more frequent.

This is what I would like to aid, and therefore what I would be glad to have the schools promote. It is often easier to exploit propositions when one has no official responsibility about them. It is sometimes disconcerting to be fettered by facts and burdened by responsibility. This question would probably be answered more to the delight of an enthusiastic conference by one who has no official responsibility about the schools, or by one who has not been in a school since childhood — which may have been as much as ten or twelve years ago. Now, no one should take offense at that, for you doubtless all know as much about schools as I do about peace.

There are schools in all countries. With this conference in mind I have caused a careful investigation to be made as to the number of teachers in the world. The figures surprise me. There are 150,000 in Austria-Hungary; as many more in France; 232,000 in Germany; 275,000 in the British Isles; 97,000 in Italy and 30,000 in the Netherlands; 180,000 in Russia; 18,000 in Sweden, and 13,000 in Switzerland; a full half million in India; 120,000 in Japan; 30,000 in Canada; and 580,000 in the United States. All the other countries, civilized or semicivilized, have their fair proportions. There are clearly more than 3,500,000 in all.

It is a great guild. There is no such widely distributed fraternity in the world. Of course there are all kinds in it, but they have much in common. It is their business to differ and their delight to discuss, but their work brings them into accord upon the essentials of right living and of international comity and brotherhood. I doubt not the predisposition of the overwhelming number, and if in some way they could be quickened to use their quiet, steady and indirect influences to substitute rational determinations for the arbitrament of the sword in settling international disputes, it would have a telling effect upon the sentiment of the world. It would seem as though, with a little governmental favor, official records, and our free communication, there might be a somewhat systematic and potential canvass of the teachers of the

world in the interest of universal good will and of the common regard for definable moral standards which ought to be inviolable in both individual and international conduct.

For example, let it be understood that one nation will not be allowed to despoil another for the sake of empire or other greed, because it is immoral, and the ordinary motive of aggressive warfare will have disappeared. For example, again, if it could be realized that all men and all governments are responsible to one another for the security of each and the opportunity of all; that all government is necessarily a burden, and that each must carry his part of the burden according to strength, the consequent feeling of comradeship in effort would become an impenetrable barrier to unholy war. The teachers of the world might, through an organized movement, become a very great force in doing all this. More thoroughly educated concerning it themselves, they would, at least by the indirect influence—which is often more telling than the direct, propagate it in all parts of the earth.

The universities may well be counted upon to give point, form and expression to the better sentiment of all countries in this behalf. It has a proper place in their offerings; it is attractive to their advanced students, and their teaching is bound to give opportunity and impetus to this good movement. Their research and their publications may well be expected to illumine and soundly expand the law of the State, and the manifest and growing comity between the universities of the more enlightened and powerful nations ought to open the way for the extension of constitutionalism to the vital issues which are inevitable in international relations. It is particularly so since the better schools of law are in organic association with universities, and more particularly still it is so since the experts in the universities are coming to be the best equipped advisers of nations upon technical points in serious international disputes.

The work of the colleges, and in some measure that of the secondary schools, may well anticipate that of the professional schools and the universities in this as in other matters. The phases of it which may properly form a part of the work of the elementary schools are not obvious. It must be said frequently that it is high time that we stopped clogging the curricula of the lower schools with so much that pupils may learn in one tenth of the time when the place for it is reached—if, indeed, there is any place for it at all. If we teach the elements of knowledge and exemplify the elements of good morals in the primary schools, we shall not be

censured if we omit constitutional law, political history, and international arbitration.

Of course there should be nothing in the schools to distort the understanding or obscure the outlook of children. It has often been said in peace conferences that the textbooks in the schools emphasize the triumphs of strife rather than the struggles and accomplishments of peace. It does not seem so to me. We can not expect the textbooks to be prepared without reference to human interest. The news and magazine writers ought not to criticize them for that. The readers and histories and geographies, in the texts and the illustrations, seem to me to exemplify very fairly the struggles and progress of all of the interests of peace in all parts of the world. The literature used by the schools is the best in the world, infinitely more choice than ever before. It is not the literature of strife so much as of peace, work, and culture. One who is advocating a particular thing is hardly likely to be an unbiased judge when his special enthusiasm is involved. In recent years there is distinctly discernible in school literature a new purpose to magnify accomplishments in the arts and sciences, rather than the triumphs of armies. And we had better not forget. History must be written truly. The boys who have ginger in them will have to know what has happened; they will have their opportunity; they will draw conclusions for themselves. The work of the schools makes for independent and virile thinking within the limits which hard facts impose, and therefore for balanced manliness and womanliness, more than ever before in human history.

We are frequently asked to set aside a day or an hour for exercises to promote this, that, or the other cause in the schools. The cause is generally a worthy one. Sometimes it is one about which patrons of the school will differ. It may have reference to trees or to birds, to Bible reading, or temperance, or woman suffrage, or athletics, or to memorials of soldiers, or tributes to authors, or to spelling in new ways, or to professors practising on guinea pigs, or to the bad influences of automobiles upon the wretches who run them, or to raising funds to be used in searching for the North Pole. I do not think these things as important as world peace, but there are misguided people who do. And it must be said, with sadness, that they are very aggressive and seem to have no care for peace at all. It can not *all* be done. Very little of it ought to be done. It is not the business of the schools to promote special causes. If attempted, it is impossible of suc-

cess without special programs and instructions, which cost time, money and labor. It is a good deal of a matter to interfere with the regular order in the thirty thousand schools in this State, for example. In private schools the authorities may do what they will about any such matter. In public schools the local authorities may do almost anything, not repugnant to law, that the general sentiment of the place will sustain. But the school authorities of an American state are not expected to promote particular causes outside the accepted functions of the schools, without the special sanction of law. A state school officer is only an administrative or executive officer. He does not own the schools. He is not to interfere too much with local rule either affirmatively or negatively. He acts for all. He acts only in matters common to all and pursuant to the will of at least the majority. If the people of the state want anything done in all the schools, and it is not being done, they will be likely to write it in the law so that the officers who may cause it to be done for them may know definitely what they want.

In a concluding word, the mind and heart of the world cherish good will and abhor war. But natural rights are cherished more than peace and they will be maintained even though conflicts ensue. In well ordered life rights are ordinarily maintained and conflicts are avoided by the submission of good citizens to the rule of law by submitting disputes to the decisions of courts, and by using the common power to punish the undesirable citizens. States which are sane enough and strong enough for this naturally come into agreeable relations with other states of like character. Commonly that is enough. But there are men and nations who prefer to be outlaws; and there are men and nations with no inclinations towards outlawry who have differences that can not be settled by discussion and agreement. Moreover, men and women do not separate into nations upon moral lines. Without much reference to causes, some in all nations would have conflict for the mere sake of conflict, or for a mere show of strength and the power to bully; some would avoid conflict at any cost; and some believe that force is never necessary to the maintenance of just principles. We have to deal with common opinion and with prevalent conditions. Differences between men will continue to arise and they will be settled by conciliation, by arbitration, by judicial determination, or by force. The more serious differences between nations, as well as between men, will have to be settled in one of these ways. Many of the differences between nations

are settled by discussion, and we hear little of them. Some are settled by arbitration, to the avoidance of many wars. But international arbitration of aggravated disputes is not much to be relied upon except between the most enlightened nations having predominant moral sense. Settlement by law will be the surer, but it depends upon common sentiment, upon some kind of continuing agreement, upon principles being reduced to form, upon an established and satisfying tribunal, upon recognized practice for joining issues and proceeding to determinations, and upon the extent of the understanding that the nations will submit to it themselves and support its judgments in all parts of the world.

This is international constitutionalism. It is constitutionalism in its fullest flower. Arbitration may avoid war; constitutionalism is a system reasonably certain to avoid war. Even more, it is forehanded, it is the object lesson, it is educative, it quickens initiative and it opens opportunity to the best impulses of all people in all the nations. The schools, particularly the schools of the masses out of whose freedom constitutionalism has always sprung, can ill afford to have no part in helping it on. But it must be a part which is neither sporadic nor spasmodic, neither memorized nor mechanical. It must spring out of that impulse and grasp which provide the background of all substantial accomplishment; it must proceed from impulse to result with due regard to the basis upon which the schools rest and all of the other interests which center in them. And that must come through the thinking of the teachers, rather than the mechanism of the schools.

THE AMERICAN TYPE OF UNIVERSITY

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, JUNE 12, 1907

Mr Chancellor, and Ladies and Gentlemen, and, more particularly, you Young Men and Women of the Class of 1907:

There is no more fascinating, indeed no more exhilarating, spectacle than a commencement scene in an American university, on a clear and bracing morning in the rosy month of June.

It is not only the hour when an eager and ambitious class — justly proud of substantial intellectual accomplishments, with the proper confidence which comes of very considerable intellectual discipline, truly courageous and sanely idealistic through much contact with the very best in human life — receives the standard stamp of approbation and commendation which the best scholarship can give; but it is also the hour when the university comes out into the open and presents to the activities of actual life the finest new energies which it can generate and train.

There are universities — and many of them — in other countries which never have commencements. They give credits for work done, and when one has enough credits he exchanges them for a degree. I say *he* because the women have little or nothing to do with it. The whole thing is as guiltless of ideality, of imagination, of incentive, of spirit in any form, as the building of a canal boat or the buying of a pair of shoes. There are universities in this country which have inherited so much from the universities of the old countries that they are able to understand the spirit and meet the educational needs of the United States only with the greatest difficulty and only in the most apprehensive, ponderous, and distressing kind of way. And there are universities in all countries which have inbred so much, which are so self-satisfied, which have got so much transmitted "culture" which did not come through heavy work, that they are innocently unjust and necessarily unfair to the people upon whom they must depend for the continuous reinforcement of virile life. There is a scholarship so unemotional as to be gloomy, so aristocratic as to be useless, so "cultured" as to be insipid, so cynical as to be tormenting; but scholarship of the modern type in America has little in common with it.

The great fact that makes a university commencement in our

country of such absorbing popular interest is that it is the annual occasion of an American university. The world sees, if willing to see, a new type of university in this country in the last half century. Let us inquire, with necessary brevity, how it has come to be, and what are the features which distinguish it.

All of the older social systems of the world, no matter how proficient in political philosophy or in the arts and sciences of civilization, have shown a distinct cleavage between the upper and the nether classes. The names of things have been different in different countries and the things themselves have had all manner of forms and colorings, but the fact has been wellnigh universal that there have been two great classes and that a small higher class has ruled a much larger lower class. As universally as this has been true, the universities have been the creations and have reflected the outlook and executed the purposes of the higher class. The outlook of the higher class has seldom caught a glimpse of the wisdom of giving every one his chance, and the self-interest of that class has never been much tempered by anxiety for widely diffusing a universal learning. The change has come through the fact that in this country the larger class is having something to say about it.

Until in our country, and practically in our time, the university has stood for some manner of exclusiveness. It may have been for a monarch and what he implies; it may have been for a more or less constitutional state; it may have been for a church; it may have been for a profession or a guild: never, until now and here, has it stood for all learning and for all the people.

This was almost as true of early American as of foreign colleges or universities. We too often forget — if, indeed, we have ever realized — that our American democracy, with its great elements of toleration, equality before the law, free right of opportunity for all, no special privileges, and with its public institutions of equal service to all, did not all at once come full-fledged into the world by the migration of a few thousand people of well settled notions across the sea. The common thought and the social and institutional life of the old world persisted in the new world. Harvard, William and Mary, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, Pennsylvania, Rutgers, Brown, Dartmouth, all stood for aristocracy in the state, for denominationalism in religion, and for a learning which was exclusively culturing and professional. They never dreamed of uplifting the common people or of applying scientific research to the industries of the country.

It does not signify any lack of appreciation of the great qualities which the early settlers brought to this country, to say that the dominant and distinguishing thought of the nation has come from the compounding of a new nation out of pretty nearly all kinds of people in the world. The very necessities of the situation have broken down all general distinctions between classes and brought forth a national political philosophy with a universal freedom of initiative and a popular efficiency in consummation which the world has never seen before. It is this which has made a new manner of university. It has remodeled the earlier universities and it has brought very quickly into vigorous life many powerful institutions which stand for the universal purpose to promote the universal good. Some of them have resulted from the benefactions of a man of wealth, some from the leadership of a great executive and the work and love of a multitude of others who had little besides work and love to give, and some through the popular determination working through the political machinery of the state. But *all* have had to appeal to a constituency which was wider than any class, or sect, or party, and such as have been able to meet the needs of such a constituency have found overwhelming support and response to their ability to do it.

It is interesting to note that the university development has been strongest where our democracy has been the freest. As new states were settled to the westward by a people who lacked little in moral purpose and nothing in initiative or in courage, they not only took good care of an elementary school system but commonly provided for a state university in their new constitutions. The older states could not do that when *they* were organized because neither legal opportunity, nor political philosophy, nor educational theory, nor the force of popular initiative were up to the point of doing it at that time. And the lead in freedom and in force of popular initiative which the newer states gained from the fulness of their opportunity, they seem likely to hold. They are certainly diffusing the higher learning more completely among all the people without regard to heredity or wealth than any other people in the world. They have established proprietorship in a universal school system of sixteen grades, beginning with the kindergarten and continuing along a smooth and unbroken road up to and through the university, which is unique in the history of education. They see, as most of us in the east do *not* see, that the logical educational result of our fundamental political theory, that every child of the republic shall have equality of opportunity,

leads to a university so free at least that no one who is prepared for it and aspires to it shall fail to get it only because he lacks the money to pay the cost. It is as inevitable as the natural out-working of our political philosophy is certain that this ideal will obtain in the course of time wherever the presence of the flag of the Union determines the educational policy of a people.

When it was settled that we were to have a universal public high school system all over this country, it was practically settled that we should have a public university system as well. One thing in intellectual evolution and educational opportunity accomplished in America, another thing—and a higher thing—will follow almost as a matter of course. If one asks where it is to end, the answer must be "I do not know." The hereafter ought to have some things to settle, and that is one of them.

The building of public high schools made it certain that the colleges already established would have to forego much of their exclusiveness and that there would be new colleges and groups of colleges in which the control would not be with any class.

The great difficulty with the systems of education in other lands is not that they have no elementary school system. They very generally have excellent ones. Attempting less than we do in the primary schools, they sometimes do it better than we do; and, better still, they have less difficulty than we do in making every child attend upon the instruction provided for him. Nor is the difficulty that they have no university system. Very generally they have an excellent one, from which we have much to learn. The difficulty is that there is no connecting link between the two, and that it is not intended that there shall be one. There is not only no continuous road from one to the other, but there are insurmountable barriers between them. The universities serve an exclusive class, and no matter how educationally entitled a child of the masses may be, it is difficult, almost to the point of prohibition, for him to secure the advantages of the advanced schools.

That is the thing which the fundamental political philosophy and the deliberate democratic purpose of this country are obviating. It is not that any of us are against all the exclusiveness that anybody wants in his private or family life. We all want some of that ourselves; it is a matter of temperament, of congeniality, of experience and of taste, and in personal affairs these are to have their way; but the public policy of the country will give every one his public chance, his equal opportunity—at least

so far as the common wealth and the common political power are used to create individual opportunity at all.

Happily, the high school movement in America has proved to be a great disorganizer of classes, as well as a great help to the diffusion of higher learning. It has made men and women of all classes know each other better and regard each other more. It has gained and retained the interest of many of quick mentality, marked business success, and newly acquired wealth in popular education. It has been the secret spring of many a great gift to a university, and of much munificence for the common good.

And, whatever else it has done, it has created an overwhelming influence for the development of universities and for determining the essential features of new universities in America. There was reason for the earliest and most decisive manifestation of this movement in the newer states. There were no old-line academies and colleges there to stand in the way of it. The settlers were of the finest New York and New England stock: they knew about the very best in education. The parents were ready to lay down their all, even their lives, for their children; and they had a clear field. Of course, with such a people the schoolhouse became the most conspicuous building in the pioneer village, and of course a little "college" sprang up in every considerable town. Of course, again, with such a people the public high school had its quickest and perhaps its most luxuriant development. The sooner the high school became a fact the sooner higher education became a passion. When the federal land grants were made to higher education in all the states, right at the darkest hour in the Civil War, the eastern states hardly knew about them at all, and have never made more than perfunctory and indifferent use of them, while the western states have seized them with avidity, put them to their utmost possibilities, added to them from ten to a hundredfold, and cry for more with an eagerness and an audacity that would have made young Oliver Twist a veritable hero.

And these federal land grants in themselves have had much to do in fixing the predominant type of university in America. With them, with the complete recognition of the principle that it is within the functions of a democratic state to do—or to delegate the legal power to do—whatsoever the people want to do for learning, and with general education boards with millions at their disposal every year for the higher institutions, it is not difficult to see that the colleges and universities in America which will

endure will minister to all the people, without reference to their means, and will promote every phase of honorable endeavor without regard to class or station.

Let it not be inferred that the typical American university is, or is to be, the poor man's university. It is not to be burdened with any qualifying adjectives. It is to be the rich man's and the poor man's alike. Its strength is, and is to be, in the fact that it is representative of the common life. It is to be no more exclusive than the constitution of the country is exclusive, save upon the one point of ability to do its work. It brings rich and poor, men and women, together upon the basis of advanced scholarship, and it gives intellect an opportunity which is distinctly higher and nobler than any that can follow the mere accidents of birth or the mere incidents of life.

No university can be a real or an effective American university and follow the exclusive educational ideals of other countries and other times. A new nation has been compounded in this country out of people from all social, industrial, political and moral conditions in the world. That nation is working out its own salvation. It is doing it upon lines that are peculiar to itself. I think it is doing it safely and effectually. The net result will be the freest and the finest uplift to the intellectual and moral state of men and women that the world has ever seen. This thing is not only going through this nation, but, largely through the instrumentality of this nation, it is going through the world. It must, of necessity, create instrumentalities which are peculiarly its own. Above all, its educational institutions of the first rank, which must regulate the ebb and flow of the nation's best and truest thought, can not be limited by ideals which had reached their zenith before our nation was born and before our political science had begun to make its revolutionary impressions upon the thinking and the destiny of mankind. Nor, indeed, can we be limited by conditions which prevail at this time in other nations and their institutions. Without, by any means, descending to the low level of declaring that things in this country are better than things in other countries only because they *are* in this country, and cheerfully recognizing the vastness of the knowledge we are yet to gain from other lands, I dare make the declaration, in words that will leave little to be misunderstood, that we can not follow the British university, with its narrow, purely classical and purely English scholarship, which is studiously prevented from being broadened by that fatuous policy of the ruling classes which stubbornly

refuses the organization of all secondary schools through which the only people who can broaden it may come to the universities at all. We can not accept the scheme of the French universities, overbalanced as they are with the mechanical and the imaginative, and dominated by the martial feeling and the military organization of a people who need the opportunity of thinking freely above all other things. Nor can we copy the German university, which puts the scientific method first, regards sound morals but little, and conveniently absolves itself from all responsibility about the character of its students, so long as they can use a microscope to magnify the strength of the empire. And if we can not be guided by the English or French or German universities, we can not be guided by any. We will take and we will leave whatever will serve our ends either by taking or leaving. We will build up institutions which make for scholarship, for freedom and for character, and which, withal, will look through American eyes upon questions of political policy, and train American hands to deftness in the constructive and manufacturing industries of most concern to the United States.

There has been no more noteworthy or promising development in our intellectual, political, or industrial life than the flocking of students in recent years to the universities which show a rational appreciation of the educational demands of our American life, and a reasonable disposition to meet the needs of the educational situation. Even where a university is not situated in a large city and is not sustained by an attendance which *will* go somewhere and can go nowhere else, it has stood in no need of students or of support if it could enter into the spirit of the Republic and would offer sound instruction which had some human interest and some real bearing upon practical training for our own professional and industrial life.

A mere English or culturing training, no matter how excellent and necessary a thing in itself, is no longer a preparation for the professions. The legal profession demands that and also a great and varied special library; a knowledge of legal history and theory; certainty about the statutes and the decisions; aptness at associating all in a comprehensive and logical whole, and readiness at applying the correct parts to new cases. It requires years of study under expert and practical teachers, with ample accommodations, in a special school, almost necessarily associated with a university. Medicine claims the English training, and then exacts years of research in chemistry, zoology, bacteriology, physi-

ology and other fundamental and kindred sciences, requiring great laboratories and costly equipment which can hardly be provided at all outside of the great universities. After that, the theory and practice specially appertaining to the profession must have a special school, and again almost necessarily, one associated with a university. It is the same with architecture, and engineering, and agriculture, and all the professional and industrial activities of the country. It is even largely so with the fine arts. All demand the libraries, and laboratories, and drafting rooms, and shops, and athletic grounds, and gymnasiums, and kitchens, and all the other things which only the large universities can provide, and all students do their own work more happily and absorb much from the work of the others when they get their training in association with the crowd in the university. Wherever the university offers all these things, there the students gather; there thought is free—but is very liable to have the conceits taken out of its freedom; there the actual doing outweighs the mere talk; there practical research cuts dogmatism to the bone; there honest work has its reward, and pretense its quick condemnation; there men and women measure up for what they *are* rather than for what they claim; there inspiration is given to every proper ambition, and there a great and true American university develops.

All this has led to some very sharp differentiation between the external forms and the manner of government and the plan of work of American and foreign universities. For example, the board of trustees is largely peculiar to American universities. It stands for the mass in university government and policy. On the other side of the sea there is no *mass* in university affairs. Charters run in the name of the king; the king is the head of the university, as of the state; and the king, or the king's minister, determines the course the university is to pursue. The early American colleges were all chartered by the king; even Parliament had no part in the matter. In the midst of the revolution, just following the defeat of St Leger at Oriskany, of Clinton in his movement up the Hudson, and of Burgoyne at Saratoga, when neither king nor Parliament were much in vogue in New York, and when a petition was presented to the young state government for the chartering of Union College, there was not a little embarrassment as to whether it should be addressed to the Governor or to the Legislature, and as to which should deal with it. Yankee ingenuity met the difficulty by addressing the prayer to both, and statecraft

split the difference by creating the Board of Regents to deal with such matters. But, however chartered, the board of trustees stands for the donors, the creators and the public, in giving trend to the course of the university. The point of it is that the founders, either the donors or the public, or both, are represented in the matter.

There is no office like our *presidency* in foreign universities. The reason for this appears in the fact that there is no faculty to be gathered, assimilated, partly eliminated, reinforced, and dealt with, according to our usage. The reason for *this* is that the intellectual provender is provided upon the *European* rather than upon the *American* plan. You pay for what you get, rather than pay for everything and then take what you like. The charges are for single courses. The professor gets the fees. The thing works automatically. If he can not teach he lacks students and soon obliterates himself. So far it is well. If another comes along who can gather students, he is welcome. There is something to be said for the system, but it lacks comprehensiveness, grasp, and the strength to bear responsibility for the balanced training of youth and the harmonious evolution of character. It will suffice where the institution has no care about intellectual balance or morals, and therefore it will not do in this country. The office of president holds things together, makes the parts fit into each other, stands for the public, the trustees, the teachers, the parents and the students, and carries the whole forward to the great ends for which a wealth of money, and of holy effort, and of the world's wisdom, has been put into it. And there is nothing clearer than that the university flourishes, that is, that the purposes of all that centers in the creation are most completely accomplished, when it has a sane and capable all-around executive who can mark out a good way and has *will* enough to make it go.

The early American colleges, copied upon foreign prototypes, have had to do so much readjusting that their old friends would not recognize them, and the ones which came a little later have naturally been created to fit a situation and fall in with a very general order. From now on they will not be able, and probably they will not be disposed, to dominate university policy in the United States. They will be obliged to work in accord with the overwhelming number of universities, colleges and secondary schools taken together. They will have to accept students *who can do their work* and who want to do it, without so much reference to how or what they have studied somewhere else. The western

boys and girls say that under the accrediting system, by which institutions are examined more than students, it is easier to get into western than into eastern universities, but that, once in, it is hard to stay in a western university, while one who gets into an eastern university can hardly fail to be graduated if he will be polite to the professors and pay the term bills. And the western people say that their way is best; that every one must have his chance; that at least his chance is not to be taken away upon a false premise; that if he "flunks out" after having had his chance it is his fault and no one is going to worry about it; and that it is better to regard the graduation standards and apply them to four years' work than to make a fetish of entrance requirements and have so much ado about prior work — about which they can know very little at the best. It is all worth thinking about. I am not a westerner: I am thoroughly a New Yorker. But I am for the open, the continuous and the smooth road from the primary school to the university, and for every one having his chance without any likelihood of his losing it upon a misunderstanding or a hazard.

The large and strong universities will not only wax larger and stronger, but they will multiply in number. Because there will be so many of them, no one of them will serve so widely scattered a constituency as heretofore. Women are going to have the same rights as men to the higher learning. Boys will not always go to a university because their grandfathers went there. The time will come, while members of this graduating class are yet in middle life, when every large and vigorous city and the territory naturally tributary thereto will have a great university, able not only to satisfy its needs of the culturing studies but also its demands for professional and business upbuilding.

What is to become of the literary colleges? They are to flourish so long as, and wherever they can provide the best instruction in the humanities, and do not assume names which they have no right to wear, and do not attempt to do work which they can do only indifferently. They will train for culture and they will prepare for the professional work as of yore. And wherever one does this well and is content to do so, it is to have every sympathy and support which an appreciative public can give. But no institutions, of whatever name or grade, are going to fool all the people for a great while, and the young men and women of America are going to have the best training that the world can give, and have it not a thousand miles from home. It is no longer necessary to

cross the sea in order to get it, and even our own older universities are close upon the time when their work must be reinforced from the newer ones, more than the newer ones from the older ones.

Obviously, the American university, as no other university in the world, must regard the life, and especially the employments, of the people. It must exhibit catholicity of spirit; it must tolerate all creeds; it must inspire all schools; it must guard all the professions, and it must strive to aid all the industries. It must quicken civic feeling in a system where all depends upon the rule of the people. It must stand for work, for work of hand as well as of head, where all toil is alike honorable and all worth is cornered upon respect for it.

In a word, our immigration is making a nation of a wholly new order; our democracy is developing a new kind of civilization; our system of common schools, primary and secondary, has brought forth a type of advanced schools peculiar to the country. Institutions that would prosper may better recognize the fact. The universities that would thrive must put away all exclusiveness and dedicate themselves to universal public service. They must not try to keep people out: they must help all who are worthy to get in. It is not necessary that all of these institutions shall stand upon exactly the same level; it is necessary that each shall have a large constituency; it is necessary that all shall connect with some schools that are below them. It is imperative that all shall value the man at his true worth and not reject him because his preparation has lacked an ingredient which a professor has been brought up to worship. Essentially so when, in case the boy has studied the subject in the high school, the professor is as likely as otherwise to tell him that he has been wrongly taught and that he must get what he has learned out of his head before he can start right and hope to know the thing as he ought. It is necessary that all shall be keen enough to see what is of human interest, and broad enough to promote every activity in which any number of people may engage.

The American university will carry the benefits of scientific research to the doors of the multitude. It will make healthier houses and handsomer streets, richer farms and safer railways, happier towns and thriftier cities, through the application of fundamental principles to all the activities of all the people. It will train balanced men and women and therefore it will promote sport as well as work and control the conduct of students as well as open their minds. It will not absolve itself from any legitimate respon-

sibilities which instructors are bound to bear towards youth. It will preserve the freedom of teaching, but it will not tolerate freakishness or license in the name of freedom of teaching. It will engage in research as well as instruction, but when men absolve themselves from teaching for the sake of research it will insist upon a grain of discovery in the course of a human life. We have a distinct national spirit in America. An American university will understand how that has come to be and what it is aiming at, will fall in with it, will be optimistic about it, and will help it on to its fullest consummation.

I have discussed this theme here because it ought to be realized by the people and particularly by the universities of New York; because I think the university which I have the honor to address is—quite as completely as any institution in the State—actuated by the spirit and outlook which an American university must have, and therefore because I had reason to believe my discussion would have hospitality under this roof. I would be false to my sense of justice and my standard of public usefulness if I did not say that since my return to the State it has appeared more and more clearly to me that the marvelous growth of Syracuse University has resulted from the fact that it has been moved by the true spirit of modern American university progress,

I know something of the details of university evolution. I know that many people have combined to produce this splendid evolution. It has all come from individual giving and cooperative effort. The people of this thrifty inland city have surely done much for it. The return upon the investment will be a great one—how great only a few can now foresee. The Methodist church has been true to its history, its character and its aggressive democratic spirit, in the valiant support it has given to this university. The donors who have made its equipment possible, the trustees who have kept it in the middle of the road, the teachers who have given it tone and distinction, the students and the graduates who have given it reputation for energy and valor, are all entitled to a warm word of commendation and congratulation from an educational representative of the State. And to you, Mr Chancellor, for the masterful management which has bound all of these factors together and wrought out this magnificent creation, I shall always, respectfully and heartfully, remove my hat.

I can not close without a direct word to this graduating class. It is essentially their day and my direct word to them has already been too long delayed. They would hardly realize that they had

been graduated, without a little preachment. Young men and women, you have now learned enough to cause you to fear a little. But fear not overmuch. You are reasonably prepared for work; hesitate not to go about it. There is a place for you, but you will have to go and win it. The rivalries will be sharp; but you have as much chance as any. Your salvation is to come through work. The world honors the man or woman who loves and honors work. It matters little what the work may be; take a step at a time and keep doing it all the time. You will always have knowledge and strength for the next step. Think not so much about the wages as about health and responsibility and the knowledge and skill for more and better work. You are not entitled to exact much yet. Make the best of whatever opens to you. Be prudent, but not overprudent. "A penny saved is a penny earned" is a maxim which is not true. In many a case the penny saved is a dollar lost, and it sometimes happens that it is public respect and fraternal regard lost. Do not stand aloof; certainly do not be a cynic; above all, do not get to be a freak. Keep step with the procession. It is a pretty good crowd and it is generally moving in the right direction. Have standards and stand by them. You can live by yourself and maintain your standards with little trouble, but then the standards will be of small account and you will make no more impression upon life than as though you had never lived. Reinforce yourself all the time. Accumulate a library. While you follow a business with devotion, seek recreation in literature, particularly in the literature of biography and history, that your lives may have more joy in them, that you may gain the inspiration that quickens action, that you may follow your business to the fullest measure of success and round out your years with the fullest regard of the people among whom you live. Be patient. Keep steady. Bide your time. Success in the game will not come by a chance play, no matter how brilliant, so much as by uniform efficiency and unceasing persistence. It is remarkable how men and women go up or down according to the direction they take and the regularity with which they keep at it. If you have a fair foothold at forty, you will be a round success at sixty. Be tolerant, but have faith in things. Do not let your student habit of inquiry and investigation unsettle all the faith that you learned at your mother's knee. Believe in your village, your ward, your city, your state. Sustain a church and at least some of the philanthropic effort that sets rather heavily on one half of the world but ameliorates the hard situations of the other half. Act with a party; yell for a ticket; whoop it up for the flag. Withal, don't take your-

selves too seriously. You will count for more if you do not. See things in sane perspective. Have a sense of humor in your outfit. Cultivate cheerfulness. Love sport, and play for all you are worth. Don't get to be one of the lunatics who work eighteen hours a day, recognize no Sundays, and never take a vacation. Submit to no coercion. Think out what is about right and stand by it. The others will eventually have to come to it. If you find you are in error, back out without attempting to disguise it; the farther on you go the more humiliation you will have. Be a good mixer. Give and take. Meet every obligation. On the basis of common decency make all the friends you can. Then you will carry the spirit of your university with you and do much to pay the debt which you will always owe her.

But be on the alert for special opportunities to help her. Assume not too conclusively that it must be in the conventional way. The unexpected will happen. Half a dozen years ago the richest man in the country became suddenly ill. In the absence of his regular physician he called in a young graduate of the Harvard School of Medicine and impulsively assured him that if he would get him out of that scrape he would pay any charge that he might make. The case was not serious to an educated man. The young man understood the difficulty and soon he wrought the needed cure. No bill was sent and in time it was asked for. The young physician reminded the multimillionaire of the promise. "Oh, yes," he said, "but I assumed, of course, that your charge would be within reason." The doctor's time had come. He said: "I shall make no charge, but I shall ask you to do something for me. The Harvard School of Medicine needs help. I would help her if I could. Under all the circumstances I feel warranted in asking you to look into the matter with a disposition to aid her justly, as you easily may." The old man said, "Would you like to bear a message to President Eliot?" "Yes." "Ask him to come and tell me all about it." In a week the man of wealth had given his pledge to the president of Harvard for a million when the balance should be raised, and in a month the five millions had been assured which have erected and equipped the finest plant for a medical college that is to be found in the wide, wide world.

You may not accomplish all these things, but if you will aim at them, if you will put the training of this university to its logical use, I am sure that when the long shadows come they will bring ease and comfort and honor and that when it is all over there will be peace with the hereafter.

NEW YORK'S OBLIGATIONS TO HER HISTORY

AN ADDRESS BEFORE THE NEW YORK STATE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION,
AT BUFFALO, SEPTEMBER 17, 1907

We are all geniuses, or copyists. If we were not we would be mere nothings and that would be simply unthinkable. Genius does great things, but it is rare. Very few of us have even a spark of it. If the fact pains us, the bruise is not without its balm. The responsibility of greatness is heavy and the appointments and accompaniments of it are often trying. Geniuses are not always comfortable persons to live with and if we may judge by appearances they do not uniformly have any too good a time of it themselves. Nor is it possible to be entirely confident that one is a genius until after he is dead. Indeed he may be misled himself. An architect may be so deceived that the new buildings within the zone of his influence will be much more original than artistic. An instructor in music in the schools may be so fascinated with his own verse and his own airs that the poor children have to go away from the schools to hear good music at all. There are museums of art which would be more impressive if they would substitute inexpensive copies of masterpieces for their more costly and commonplace originals. There need be no fear of discouraging true genius. It can not be helped by the commonplace. Only through exacting criticisms, indeed only through adversity and struggling, can it come into the possession of its own.

Essentially we are copyists. We do as other people do. In our dress, in our structures, in our food, in our reading and our thinking, even in our ambitions and undertakings we imitate other people. We are very dependent upon our contacts and associations. Character is hammered out upon the anvil of experience. Iron has one price in the ore, another in the pig, another in steel rails, another in razor blades, and yet another in cambric needles or watch springs. All depends upon the processes and the batterings it goes through. It is the same in the world's ratings of men and women. We absorb more than we initiate and doubtless the influences of which we are unthoughtful are deeper than those of which we are particularly reminded.

Association and imitation are natural, agreeable, logical, successful. Separateness is difficult, practically impossible, simulated

rather than real, unprofitable rather than productive. It is well to go into the crowd. No one need be ashamed of copying. It is better to stand for decency in the crowd, and generally we do; to be discriminating in the copying, and ordinarily we are. The common advance which we are bound to recognize proves that, at least since the flood, the majority has kept company with decency and progress. We show the best we have at the fairs and the expositions; we do the best we can when others are looking on; and we copy the attractive, the enduring, the ennobling. We accept those things which stir the self-consciousness which the Almighty has implanted in us. Genius is the instrument of God in the development of mankind, and conventionality is only the respect which intelligence has to pay to the thinking and the usage of the multitude. Our intuitions rest upon good footings; the sentiment of the crowd is almost unerring. It is certainly so where discussion is unrestrained, where there is responsibility for action, and where there is the possibility of free public opinion. There the worthless things are transitory and the best become the constants. There opportunity stands upon the shoulders of accomplishment and ambition mounts to the very peaks of possibility.

With peoples it is the same as with individuals. Where the conscience of mankind has opportunity and expression, the generations are progressive. There may be progress where there is a cleavage in society; where a monarch or an aristocracy determine the policies of the mass and do it with reasonably sound purposes and ordinarily sane thinking; where the inevitable greed of personal advantage and special privilege is held in check by the possibility of a revolution; but there is a nobler, truer, stronger and more rapid progress where all the people have the advantage of free discussion and steadying influences of responsibility, where there is interdependence between men and women of all conditions, and where all the thinking and all the ambitions and all the conditions of all the people are factors in determining the law and the policies, the opportunities and the ambitions, of the mass.

Where there is progress there is obligation to what has gone before. Things worth having seldom spring full-fledged and unexpectedly into being. The world's progress is predicated upon conscience and discussion and cooperation and ambition and self-denial and sorrow. Every traveler who has added to our information, every scientist who has unlocked a new truth, every artist who has given us a more beautiful expression of form, every ministering angel who has quickened our sense of brotherhood by



extending succor to a suffering one, every missionary who has carried the cross into the wilderness, every author who has aroused rational imagination or stirred harmless humor or enlarged logical reasoning, every orator who has quickened ambition, every statesman who has stood for the equality of right and the freedom of opportunity, every soldier who has laid down his life for liberty controlled by law, has placed every one of us under obligations to him.

It is so with each of us and equally so with our generation; it is so with our political society, with that closer union of mankind which is imperative to the moral well being of men and women who live together under free institutions. If each of us owes a debt to ennobling and inspiring example, then our generation rests under enduring obligations to other generations which have cleared the wilderness and subdued the soil; which have in battle decided what manner of institutions the country should have; which have written and interpreted and successfully applied humane and just laws; which have accomplished physical undertakings unexcelled by any people; which have erected all of the instrumentalities of intellectual culture known in any land; and have in not a few particulars gone before any people in any land in reaching toward the great ideal ends for which governments are established among men.

The society which I have the honor to address needs no reminder that the history of New York is one of surpassing interest. Even if we make allowance for the patriotic fervor which the native children of the State must have in its career and look at it with the unbiased eye of the philosopher or the historian, we must know that it is a fascinating story. We can not treat much of details tonight but I am sure you will bear with me while I present some phases of the subject which I ought to be able to make of interest to you and which ought to deepen our sense of gratitude to the men and women gone before.

It was fortunate for many reasons that the territory of the State was first settled by Dutchmen. They came with the favor and the aid, and not with the opposition, of their government. They came from a people who were further advanced in the higher learning and in the diffusion of elemental knowledge, and in the arts and crafts and in maritime commerce, and in political freedom and in institutional development than any other nation in the world, not excepting Britain at that time. All this had not come at first hand from the forces which produced our modern civiliza-

tion, for those forces came into operation with the birth of Christianity and seem to have required a thousand and a half of years for their outworking in the intellectual and political as well as the religious development of Europe, but it did come from the first great and successful religious reformation and it did come, as swiftly and directly as ever an arrow sped from a bow, from the first dreadful and decisive war for religious and political freedom that the world had ever seen.

It is true that the Dutch came hither for trade and commerce; it is also true that the motive was a worthy one. It was the natural expanding of a people with newly won freedom. It was the beginning of what we have seen in such abundant measure since. And, whatever the motive, they brought their home feelings and outlook and institutions with them. They made no attempt at a theocracy or an aristocracy. For fifty years, while their little town grew slowly at the mouth of the Hudson and small hamlets were planted upon either side of the river to the north, they quietly and modestly, but firmly and decisively, set up schools and churches and courts and all the institutions of our modern society. They exercised freedom while they observed its limitations and obligations. Of course they introduced the forms and usages of the Netherlands, as they gathered the fruits of their frugality and the energy of their trade.

Even for a hundred years after they were unjustly overthrown by the accumulating power and ambitious designs of the English arms they struggled with their adversaries for the free schools and the free worship which their fathers had established by their valor in the Low Countries. Nor did they struggle in vain. Dutch and English were merged in the fires of the Revolution but in the process of assimilation quite as much of the Dutch as of the English survived. Much in the way of craftsmanship, and diversified agriculture, and domestic thrift, and land tenures, and scientific investigation, and even of the fine arts, and religious toleration, and of political equality, and of cooperative effectiveness endures to this day.

The outcome of the Revolution put a new face upon the affairs of New York more decisively and quickly than upon those of any other state. The men and women of New England then, and not till then, began the unending migration to the westward. The Englishmen who came over the Berkshires had developed for obvious reasons into a different sort of Englishmen from those who had been coming through the Narrows. And it might be ob-

served that those who came through the Narrows after the Revolution must have come with a different outlook and may have spoken in a milder tone than those who came before. Be that as it may, there was not much in common between New York and New England before the Revolution. New England at the close of the eighteenth century was not so very different from old England at the opening of the seventeenth. It was in a state of quiescent and serene religious intolerance which New York had never known. It was a condition which continued there to a later time than anywhere else in the country. New England Puritanism was a noble cult, certainly it was the embodiment of sincerity, of principle, and of character. Quite as certainly it was the embodiment of self-content and of tenacity. But when it came to close quarters with another people of quite as much character, quite as much poise, and quite as much tenacity, the hour had come when a new measure of mutual respect and a new measure of toleration could be the only issue of the contact. And this it was which caused the pledge of absolute religious freedom, of the complete dissociation of worship and of political administration, to be enshrined in the written constitution of New York before it found a place in that of any other state of the Union. It must have been the want of it which caused Massachusetts to be the very last of the original states to put that pledge in her constitution.

When the foundations had been laid the greatness of the Empire State became possible. It had already commenced. But what a labor in the beginning! Those were the days of farms, not of towns and cities. Think of the task of the pioneer farmers among the hills and rocks and unbroken forests between the Hudson and the Montezuma marshes. The western men are accustomed to say that if the early settlers had known of the black, rich land upon the prairies, New England and New York would never have been settled at all. Be that as it may, they were settled and well settled. Clearings were made, and houses were built, and pastures were made ample, and herds were grown. Meadows appeared and great highways were opened. Churches were established in every town; often where there was no town. A school was set up at every crossing of the roads. Sons and daughters in liberal numbers were grown also. All worked with their hands in the house or upon the land. The overwhelming number worked with their heads also. There was no rich or idle class. There was no tenant farming. There was a distinctly new order of rural society, and there was abundant result. All that was needed was produced

on the place. Fresh beef was a little scarce, but lambs and chickens were always at hand. The smokehouse was never empty and the cellar always full. The cooking would honor a palace. Hospitality was as warm as the sunshine and as free as the air. There was much going to and fro, between the busy seasons, and good fellowship and much public enterprise prevailed. There was no meanness under the guise of politeness and no subtle maneuvering to satisfy greed at the cost of another, or if there was it was punished harshly. There was much blunt and sincere and earnest and productive living. The result was a noble state, the first agricultural state in the Union. We lift our hats to the men and women who made it so and we would to God that some turn in the wheel of economics, without taking away what has followed, might bring it all back again.

Of the foundations and the growth of our material prosperity it is necessary to say but little. We have doubtless had some advantage from situation but it has not been an exclusive advantage. There are other great harbors than ours upon the Atlantic coast and other peoples might have built great waterways to the westward. The foresight and courage which put \$9,000,000 into the original building and \$25,000,000 into the enlargement of the canal from Lake Erie to the Hudson long years ago were possible because of the leadership which the State had already gained in trade and commerce. That leadership related back to the energy and the honor of New York merchants in the colonial days. For full forty years the Erie canal was building before a shovelful of earth was turned. It was discussed by statesmen and planned by engineers for all that time. More than once the other states had the opportunity to share in the expense, in the advantage and in the glory and, happily for us, refused. It took a stouter courage to do it than it requires to spend a hundred millions in constructing a ship or barge canal and a hundred and fifty millions in improving the highways now. It made easily possible our great cities and great railways, great buildings and great bridges and marvelous tunnels, and all the other evidences of good government, of material prosperity, and of engineering skill. When we are prone to boast that our leadership in banking and manufactures and commerce has never been in hazard and seems more secure now than ever, it is well to remember that it did not come in a day or a generation and that it might not have come at all but for the foundations which were laid by heroic generations of New York men and women who are gone.

Our educational system is unique, not so much because of what we have done as of what our fathers did. The American educational plan is unique; but the New York educational scheme is unique in the American plan. The Dutch influences have been very considerable and they persist to this day. Our State gives more support to and exercises, when necessary, more control over schools than any other state. The schools are more closely bound together in a state system. There is more done to assure a fair schoolhouse and a suitable school in places where the people are poor or indifferent. Special aid is given to the advanced schools, as nowhere else. All kinds and grades of schools are encouraged and very considerable progress has been made in binding them together in oneness of system. All manner of instructional instrumentalities outside of the schools are looked after and, so far as practicable, made parts of the State educational system. The State has established the standards for admission to the professions upon a plane which is almost prohibitive of professional reciprocity with other states. Our laws and our practices prevent fakes and punish frauds much more drastically than those of our neighbors do. Now and then someone protests against centralized authority. Protests may be healthy in administration. They often serve to keep us in the middle of the road. Surely our policy should not go to the length of supporting schools where they need no aid, nor of using the schools to promote special interests, nor of limiting freedom of teaching, nor of hampering any community in freely managing the business interests of the schools where the management is not a travesty upon sense and a fraud upon rights which are inviolable, nor of doing anything else which is not good for all of the people and all of the moral and intellectual interests of the commonwealth. The fundamental thought of the New York educational system is that the intellectual interests of every child of the State is the common interest of every citizen of the State and of every dollar of valuation in the enormous property of the State. The strong and the rich must help the weak and the poor. It is this that makes the cities raise millions every year beyond what they need for their own schools to aid the schools outside of the cities, as is done in few other states, and in no other state in anything like equal measure. It is this which goes as far as a state can go in equalizing educational opportunity to all. If it discourages novelties in psychology, and freakishness in pedagogy, and graft in administration, it impedes neither the sane thinking nor the rational undertakings of any one. And in any

event, no one who is now living is responsible for it. If one will quarrel with it he must quarrel with men who are dead. It is the distinct and long-time policy of the State. It has developed out of our history. It has developed because of universal state pride and generosity and courage in all that concerns New York, because it was believed to be necessary and has been found to be good, and because the practically universal sentiment believes in it and supports it overwhelmingly. It was commenced as soon as the State could gather up its thoughts and bring together some scattered resources after the practical annihilation they had suffered through the central position which it had held in the War for Independence. It is because the statesmen of New York raised and distributed half a million to aid the schools in the closing years of the eighteenth century, upon a plan that was exclusively their own, that the state tax levy can carry six or seven millions for education in each of the opening years of the twentieth century and no one dissent in any quarter. It is because of the foundations which our fathers laid; because the principle that intellectual evolution is not a matter of local but is rather one of universal concern was made the corner stone of that foundation; that the common sentiment and the accumulating wealth of the people of New York leads them to put seventy millions of dollars each year to the uses of education and open wide the door of opportunity to all within our borders.

The strong and steady unfolding of the professional life of New York is a story which, in any comprehensive or philosophical form, is yet to be written. The family doctor was not a quack; the lawyer was not a pettifogger. Quacks and pettifoggers were even more quickly distinguished and bluntly described in the early days than now. And in the early days there were boys who were glad to wear clothes smuttled with honest toil, and happy in working with their hands. Few of them aspired to the professions; and the one fundamental principle that every one must have his equal chance had not been worked out in our system of education then as now. We are at the very front in requiring that the candidate must have at least four years of work of academic grade, four years of work in an approved professional school, the bachelor's degree from an approved institution authorized to confer it, and a certificate earned in the State examinations, before he can practise his profession; but it may well be doubted whether professional capacity is as much regarded by the people of the State as it was a half century ago. Be that as it may, certain it is that

the strong men in the professions were relatively more influential in primitive conditions than now. Medical integrity and experience counted for more when medical knowledge was in its infancy; legal learning was more potent when our unique and independent judicial system was in its experimental stages and principles rather than precedents were necessarily the guides; and the minister, with his hard and fast theology, impressed minds more deeply when he was pretty nearly the exclusive intellectual force in the everyday life of people whose labor was mainly with their hands. And the legal, medical and clerical professions have from the beginning laid New York under heavy obligations to them. Indeed those professions have been so distinguished and the obligations to them are so great that a mere passing reference to them seems altogether lacking in the bare justice which is their due.

Something more than the merest incidental reference to the bearing of the clergy upon the intellectual life of our fathers should be said concerning the religious history of the State. It has already been pointed out that toleration made exceptionally early progress here because of the mixing of two very different and very forceful civilizations. Toleration of religious differences nourishes and propagates pure religion quite as much as it makes for intellectual progress. It brings more respect for reason than for authority, and any religion that is potential must spring from feeling, guided by reason rather than directed by power. Men and women are naturally religious; they respond to control and direction only from the necessities of the situation, and religion is satisfying and potential only where the external expression of it is free and respected. This grows as intelligence advances. Religious freedom and intellectual freedom have aided each other in all ages, the world over. A religious machine with political and military power behind it hinders both moral and mental progress. It looks as though all the world is about to realize this. New York realized it very early and very clearly. Resenting the power of a church in the affairs of the State, assuming universal education as a public charge, and assuring it through the definite support and control of the State, New York, almost from the beginning, was conspicuously helpful to the freedom and the rationality of religious life. It very early forced decisive changes in mere theology and a material decline in mere ecclesiasticism. It did not lessen the spirituality of it. Indeed it widened the application of it. It began to take out of it the absurdities which the

most devout found it very difficult to explain or overlook. It took the pugnacities as well as the absurdities out of it. It attracted human nature, no matter what language it spoke or whether it prayed standing, sitting, kneeling, or with no required posturing; or indeed though it had no form of prayer beyond the breathing of one's feelings to himself. It made for universal brotherhood, for mutual respect, for the common policies by which all could live, for freedom within the State, but for a stronger state to suppress license and excess, and therefore for neighborliness, for co-operation in the industries and in education and in all the things which make the commonwealth great. It would of course be too much to say that this was exclusive with New York, but it is none too much to say that it was unprecedented in New York, that it was the potential cause of the State's early and strong development in people, and in property, and in usefulness, and that we would be thoroughly unjust to the men and women gone before us, and who made it, if we failed to recognize the fact.

Even in such a cursory exploitation of my theme, mention must be made of the scientific work which our State has done, not through its colleges but by its own officials, for at least two full generations. In all of the sciences related to economic interests we have carried research farther by our own agents than any other state has thought of. The indefatigable industry and belligerent disposition of James Hall, for almost sixty years State Geologist, caused the territory of the State to be more completely investigated and charted, geologically, than any other like extent of territory in the world. He loved his science with the enthusiasm of a girl and fought for it with the ferocity of a lion. More than twenty-five years ago I was a member of the ways and means committee of the Assembly when Dr Hall came to appeal for another appropriation to *finish* his paleontology. He had many times given assurances about completing it in order to smooth the road for appropriations, and the committee had become somewhat enlightened and skeptical. They prodded him with the demand that he should fix the limits of time and money necessary to complete the work. "Do you expect science to be bound by laws and contracts?" he demanded. "Yes, and this paleontology business must be settled in this bill or there will be no appropriation," they answered. The old man raised his eyes to Heaven, in disgust more than in prayer, and he brought his clinched fist down upon the table with a bang as he said "My God! that science ever had to wait on the maneuvers of a *legislative committee*." It is super-

fluous to remark that he got his appropriation. He printed much and he had much trouble with unscientific printers. I once heard him say to the State Printer "Mr Van Benthuyssen, you tear my theology all to pieces." "How's that?" asked the head of the great printing house. "I don't believe in a hell" he answered, "but there ought to be one to which *printers* could be sent." Be that as it may, I doubt not that if you would ask any scientific man in Europe who had not traveled in America what he thought about the states he would first express his appreciation of the geological and other scientific publications of the State of New York.

And the aid which the State has given to natural science through publication it has also given to history. With a freedom bordering upon prodigality it has printed everything that could be expected from its commanding position or be informing to its people. Perhaps it has not always been discriminating. Very likely the profits of the printers have aided the wisdom of the Legislatures and lent energy to the revolutions of the press, but there is another side to it. They have stimulated scholarship and research and authorship, and all together they have saved much from permanent loss, provided us with an inexhaustible mine of material, and encouraged investigation and authorship for all time to come. More than once this State has sent its agents abroad to rescue scraps of its colonial history from utter loss; many times it has initiated steps for reclaiming important happenings from obscurity or misinterpretation, and always it has shown a quick interest in all that could aid the intellectual virility and balance of its people. And what the State has done the men and women of the State have done. What the State has done, its Board of Regents, its colleges, and academies, and professional schools, its editors and merchants and engineers and historians and governors and legislators, have done to break out its roads and follow them to surprising consummations.

This brings us to a word about our political evolution,—not the story of party contests, but the steady unfolding of political institutions, assuring equality of great opportunity, and bringing forth surprising issues, through the making of laws and the exercise of the powers of government by many millions of widely different people.

Since the first Constitution, made in 1777, we have radically reformed the fundamental instrument of the State government three times, namely, in 1821, 1846 and 1894. In 1867 a constitu-

tional convention prepared a new instrument which was, except as to the judiciary article, rejected by the people. We have adopted sixty-six amendments to the Constitution in twenty different years. It must be observed that we have exhibited confidence, as well as exercised freedom, concerning what is justly held to be a very sacred instrument in meeting new situations. The statutes enacted by the Legislature would, with pardonable exaggeration, make a pile as high as Mount Marcy. The judicial construction, interpretation, adjustment, and annulment of many of these written laws have occupied the industrious attention of a long and learned bench from the beginning.

There are those who are prone to criticize the freedom and the volume of our lawmaking. I have but little sympathy with them. Of course, many things are done inconsiderately and inconsistently. There is little harm except to create the greater need for multiplying judges, and the judges at least will admit that that is not without its compensations.

Under our free and unique system for annulling laws which are in conflict with the Constitution, there is no danger. The overwhelming advantage is in the open channels it makes for the free flow of our democracy and the quick opportunity which it provides for meeting new situations in authoritative ways. Our much legislation has often helped us at what seemed the breaking point. It has been the vehicle of our rapid progress. One state has copied from another and thus it often happens that many states have had the natural advance of twenty years in one. The judiciary of New York, with exceptions so rare as not to be in the reckoning, has always been independent, patriotic, and learned. The law reports of New York are held in unfeigned respect in all parts of the world. The system is unique in nation building; but it is balanced, logical, safe. It was vital to a rapidly growing nation of free and widely different people like ours. It adjusts itself to the multiplying millions, it stops a runaway before the brink is reached, and it gives opportunity to the material, intellectual, and moral progress which all good Americans want. And how the forming of it, and the administration of it trains the ambition, and the freedom, and the knowledge, and the self-restraint, and the sense of responsibility of honest people! How it develops very ordinary men into very efficient leaders! How it opens the possibilities to each and keeps the whole mass moving on!

And the product has been as satisfactory as the method has been logical and free. Here we are, eight millions of people in a

highly organized political society. Since the days when the Dutch and the English liberalized the thinking and added to the strength, the security and the opportunity of each by assimilation, we have received a copious stream of immigration from nearly every people under the sun. History has again and again repeated itself. Apprehension has uniformly given place to new confidence, greater strength, and larger undertakings. Security and opportunity have not grown less, but greater. The new factors have made the fundamental principles of our democratic philosophy more imperative. The statutes and the decisions have more and more reflected the new situations. The making of the law has had to contend with problems that were so new and so hard that it has been halted for the moment, and blundered now and then; but the clarity and the force and the balance which public opinion gains through its operation in the presence of danger have been uniformly triumphant. In spite of the forebodings of the conservatives and the predictions of the pessimists, whom we have always had with us and who are doubtless very necessary wheels in our political machinery, we have come very near proving the practicability of pure democracy through the rational exercise of our political powers.

I shall use but one further illustration to enforce the lesson of my theme. It is an important one,—the story of military accomplishment in the Empire State. I can only allude to it. All the leading nations are now in conference at the Hague for the purpose of promoting international comity by agreement, by arbitration, and by establishing constitutionalism between, as well as within, the political organizations of the peoples of the world. The outworking of Christianity, which has not only enlarged but has diffused learning, and the obvious advantage of common obedience to just law over the mere submission to physical force, are overcoming the brutal disposition to engage in war. But wars have been imperative, if freedom was to triumph over power and right was to compel ignorance and greed to open the door to opportunity. And happy indeed may that people be who have reason enough to know that their religious and educational and institutional heritage did not come through aggressive warfare for the sake of empire or unlawful gain, but did come through the fact that their fathers knew what their natural rights were and had the valor with which to gain them.

There is hardly a county in New York which has not been the scene of heroic struggles. There is scarcely a town without heroic

incident and tradition. Everywhere there are houses bearing the marks of conflict, and here and there are the earthworks and other remains of heavy battles which decided much in the history of America. Once in a while a monument or a tablet proves that a few people have memory and appreciation, but the greater number are too often ignorant or indifferent about the events which make grounds sacred.

When civilization took up its march across this country from east to west, it everywhere found in the Indians subtle and dangerous foes. The struggle, which in its deadly form began with King Philip in New England, in the seventeenth century, has led trails of blood all the way to the Golden Gate and continued quite to our day. Nowhere was it so bitter as in New York, for the Iroquois were the royalists of Indian life. It is idle to doubt or debate the moral rights of the matter now. A great land must inevitably go to the people who will put it to its best uses. Legal or moral title to the earth's surface must rest upon something more than savage uses. White civilization might well have paid some other price than the one it did to extinguish any rights in the soil which roving wild men had in it. It was certainly so where the foe to its progress was so subtle in diplomacy and so savage in war as the Five Nations. The tribute they exacted was the blood of the settlers without discrimination. They terrorized every cabin and filled the land with horror; but they made warriors and strategists and statesmen of pioneer farmers.

Until close to the hour of the Revolution the northern border of New York was the mainly inhabited frontier of English civilization in America. Our territory was the base of military operations and, so far as we had men to serve, they were in the forefront of the battalions which determined by their valor that the predominant power and the enduring civilization in America, with all that that fact implies, was to be English rather than French. Indeed the most of the hardest fighting was upon our soil. The names of Niagara and Frontenac should signify something very different from what they do; there should be something very unlike a summer hotel where Fort William Henry stood; and the neglected and crumbling ruins at Ticonderoga,—the key to the strategic situation and scene of historic events in two wars for English freedom in America, might well be cherished and protected by the State, for they are the noblest expression we have or can have of the times which both tried men's souls and made men great.

The conditions which made New York fighting ground in the French and Indian wars made it even more so after Canada had passed over to the English crown and the war for American independence was on. In the beginning Britain was organized and in possession and if she could hold this territory she would cut the embryonic republic in twain and triumph in the end. By intrigue, gifts and abhorrent promises the Indians had been brought into sympathy and service with the crown. The white settlements were far apart. The skulking foes that infested the woods on every side were quite as dangerous as the British regulars who lived in camps and moved in brigades. While our only seaport was held by the invading army from the beginning to the end of the struggle, the yeoman of the interior cleared their territory of both regulars and savages before, in point of time, the bitter conflict was halfway over. Of course, they did not do it alone but they certainly held the right of the line that did do it. The grades and the waterways from the mouth to the headwaters of the Hudson and then from the head of Lake George to the outlet of Champlain may be said in all truth to have been the veritable warpath of the Revolution. Nature made it so. The highest point in the whole distance is less than a hundred and fifty feet above the level of the sea. Considerably more than half of the three hundred and fifty miles was navigable by the largest vessels and all but twenty miles of it could be traversed by smaller craft. It was well known for it had been the trail of the savages, "the dark and bloody ground," for centuries. Practically the same was true of the beautiful valley from the mouth to the source of the Mohawk. The only place where the Atlantic watershed breaks through the Appalachian mountains is at Little Falls. The route is practically level and has almost as short a carry between the headwaters of the Mohawk and those of Oneida lake as that upon the other trail. Small craft may be floated all the way from Ontario to the Atlantic.

When it was evident that neither New England nor the mouth of the Hudson could be held by the Americans, the eyes of both combatants turned to these natural thoroughfares between our great harbor which was the comfortable rendezvous of the British navy, and Canada the hospitable base and stronghold of the British army. Something more than eyes were turned. The first substantial feat of American arms was in the capture of Crown Point and Ticonderoga. The first American navy was upon Lake Champlain. The most comprehensive and strategic campaign of the

British forces in the entire war embraced the advance of one army up the Hudson, of another from Canada up Lake Champlain and Lake George, and of a third across Lake Ontario and down the Mohawk. With bombast and bluster and tripping step they were to occupy these thoroughfares, make a junction at Albany and grasp the key to the situation. The western army was annihilated at Oriskany by the sturdy yeomen in the valley, after they had lost a larger percentage of dead and wounded than was suffered by American troops in any other engagement in the war. The northern army under the proudest general of the crown, haughtily boasting that "Britains never retreat" marched directly to decisive defeat and humiliating surrender at Saratoga. When the news of Oriskany and Saratoga reached the southern army it turned about and imitated the lower Hudson in its hurried and limpid course to the sea. And when all this was followed by Sullivan's conclusive punishment of the Iroquois and their allies in the Wyoming valley, the rest was largely a matter of endurance until the King should tire of the waiting and the expense, or the cabinet should give way to another which would stand again for the fundamentals of English liberty.

We must lay no claim to what is not justly ours. But we owe it to our fathers and to our children to prevent literary fiction and much repetition from perverting a true understanding of historic facts. The first blood of the Revolution was spilled in New York and not in Boston.¹ Every home in our sparsely settled State was in deadly danger from the capture of Ticonderoga till the annihilation of the Indians from the Hudson river to the Genesee country. What memories the names of Cobleskill, Schoharie,

¹ As this statement has been questioned since the address was delivered, it seems well to say that reference was made to the conflict at Golden hill (now John street) between Cliff street and Burling slip, on January 18, 1770. The Patriots having erected a "Liberty Pole," the King's troops quartered in the city destroyed it on the night of January 16. The next day a meeting of citizens resolved that any soldiers found in the night with arms, or out of barracks after roll call and behaving in an insulting manner, should be treated as enemies to the peace of the city. On January 18 scurrilous placards, impugning the motives and character of the Sons of Liberty, and signed "The Sixteenth Regiment of Foot" were posted about the city. Three soldiers caught posting one of these placards were seized by citizens and taken before the mayor. A company of soldiers came to release their companions. A conflict ensued and in the course of the day there was a second one, in which one citizen was killed, three wounded, and a large number more or less injured. It was much the same kind of an affair as the Boston Massacre, which occurred March 5, 1770, a month and a half later. The Golden hill affair, therefore, was undoubtedly the first armed conflict resulting in the shedding of blood in the Revolution.

Cherry Valley, Springfield, Canajoharie, German Flats, Minisink and many others may well revive? Oriskany in severity and in results was a heavier battle than Bunker Hill. Saratoga was the decisive engagement of the war. Of course, all that was done in New York was not done by New York men but with main reliance upon volunteer soldiers the men of a state were necessarily at the forefront of any warfare within their borders. At Oriskany the New York Militia put British regulars, and Tories, and Indians to the sword. There the flag of the United States was first unfurled in battle. Forced by their situation to bear the leading part in the Revolution, the men of New York, as Wayne wrote Washington of the men who captured Stony Point, "behaved like men determined to be free."

There is no need to speak of the course of this State in the second war with Great Britain, in the unnecessary and unjust war with Mexico, in the awful struggle to save the Union from overthrow by the slave power, or in the expulsion of Spain and the protection of Cuba. We have never sought quarrels. We have had interests which quickened the wish of rational men and women to live at peace with our neighbors and all the world. But the State of New York never turned from a duty. Whenever she has deemed it necessary to exercise force she has done it with a spirit and a completeness which emphasize another phase of the debt which all of her children owe her.

There is much more to be said, but little more can be said tonight. No one knows better than the members of the State Historical Society, of whom I am happy in being one, how very fragmentary has been my treatment of a great theme. Your knowledge of the breadth and depth of the subject and of the limitations which the need of brevity imposes upon a speaker will make you considerate of the inadequacy of the presentation. Possibly the brief form, which may easily be placed before many people, may signify to increased numbers something of our neglect of our history and somewhat of our duty to the men and women who have made it.

Our fathers were not much given to leaving records for their children. Those children have been frequently unmindful, often indifferent, sometimes inaccurate. We have uniformly been engrossed with innumerable activities and the very volume of our history makes it difficult to popularize it. Many have come among us in later years who are valiantly helping us to make more his-

tory, who can not easily appreciate our early history, for they are a part of the story of another people struggling for the democracy which has come to be more stable here than in any other land under the sun. The writers of American history have, for the most part, lived in other states and they have written under the spell which other associations impose upon them. We have not been much aided by song and story; at times we have been injured by literary humor which other peoples seemed unable to grasp. The children in the schools, often the students in the colleges and universities, more often still the men and women of our busy cities and towns, know but little of the splendid story and appreciate all too lightly the obligations which it imposes.

If we could mend this, if we could stir popular enthusiasm, if we could quicken investigation by scholars and present the results in more popular form, if we could effectuate a deeper and more general appreciation of the fundamental causes of the primacy and the power of the State, we would at one and the same time give justice to the past and invaluable service to the future. The government of the State will give any proper aid which the thoughtfulness of this society, the work of scholars, or the patriotism of the people, will seriously suggest.

But, after all, the writing of history is not the only way of expressing our obligations to the makers of it. Here we are, eight millions of every kind of people that the sun ever shone upon, proving the stability and the potentiality of a pure democracy. We are not in peril; we confide absolutely in our security. Discussion is freer, sentiment makes more rapidly, and conclusions are surer and sounder than ever before. We can do anything we think well to do. The commercial primacy of the State seems sure enough but endless measures are in progress to make it doubly sure. The national centers of the publishing business, of finance, and of manufactures are within our borders. The problem of absolute democracy in religion has worked out to a complete solution. So the great problem of democracy in education is well advanced and the solution is inevitable. We are just now in the midst of the complete applications of the fundamental principles of our democracy to our industries. We are beginning to make and enforce laws which will promote all the just interests of both capital and labor and limit the improper exercise of the organized power of each. Our children will wonder that we had so much trouble making it clear that the common power can be used only in

the common interest, and that in our business, as well as in our religion, our education, and our politics, every child of the nation is to have his free and equal chance. If we make it completely so, as seems likely enough, we shall show to all the world that democracy opens opportunity to moral and material progress, and we shall discharge a part of the obligation which our generation of freemen owes to the generations of freemen who have gone before.

ILLITERACY IN THE UNITED STATES

REPRINTED FROM THE YOUTH'S COMPANION, BY COURTESY OF THE
PERRY MASON COMPANY

We have very exact information about the number of people in the United States who are illiterates. By an "illiterate" we mean a person who is ten years old or more and can not write in any language. It is generally true that if one can not write he can not read.

The proportion of illiterates is smaller than it used to be. In 1870 there were 200 illiterates to each 1000 of population; in 1880 there were 170; in 1890 there were 133; in 1900 there were 107.

The accompanying table will show the number of illiterates to each 1000 people in the various states in 1900.

These figures are from the census, but a table from election returns showing the number of illiterate voters per thousand people in each state is so nearly the same that it confirms the substantial accuracy of the census figures.

We may be interested to see how the number of illiterates in our states compares with the number in the best educated countries of Europe.

In every nine voters we have one full grown man who can not read or write. We have no basis of exact comparison, but there are related and authentic figures which are more convincing than comforting.

TABLE SHOWING NUMBER OF ILLITERATES IN EACH THOUSAND OF
POPULATION BY CENSUS OF 1900

Iowa	23	Colorado	42
Nebraska	23	Indiana	46
Kansas	29	Idaho	46
Washington	31	Wisconsin	47
Utah	31	California	48
Oregon	33	South Dakota	50
Ohio	40	Maine	51
Wyoming	40	New York	55
Minnesota	41	Oklahoma	55
Illinois	42	North Dakota	56
Michigan	42	Vermont	58

Massachusetts	59	Kentucky	165
New Jersey	59	Arkansas	204
Connecticut	59	Tennessee	207
Pennsylvania	61	Florida	219
Montana	61	Virginia	229
New Hampshire	62	North Carolina	287
Missouri	64	Arizona	290
Rhode Island	84	Georgia	305
Maryland	111	Mississippi	320
West Virginia	114	New Mexico	332
Delaware	120	Alabama	340
Nevada	133	South Carolina	359
Texas	145	Louisiana	385

The Imperial Bureau of Statistics at Berlin informs us that of all the recruits in the German army in 1903, but 1 in 2500 was illiterate. In Sweden and Norway it was but 1 in 1250; in Denmark, 1 in 500; in Switzerland, 1 in 166; in Holland, 1 in 40; in France, 1 in 16. In 1902, in England and Scotland, 1 man in 40 and 1 woman in 40 were unable to write their names when married. In other words, we appear to have more than four times as many illiterates as there are in England and Scotland, and infinitely more than there are in Denmark, Sweden and Norway, and the German Empire.

About four fifths of our American illiterates were born, or their parents were born, among the most unfavored people of the Old World. But that fact must not lead us to suppose that we have but few illiterates born in this country. The fact is, that in many of our states we have more illiterates whose parents are natives than those whose parents are foreign born. In New York State in 1900 there were 29,188 of the former and 18,162 of the latter. And New York is not at all exceptional.

If we expect to find a larger percentage of illiteracy in the cities than in the country, we must be disappointed. The percentage of illiteracy in New York City, and in our other large cities, is less than in many rural counties, and is not greater than in the average rural county. The percentage of illiterates who are American born is much larger in the country than in the cities. Indeed, there are few if any rural counties which show so small a percentage of native illiterates as the largest cities show. The city and county of New York has a smaller percentage of illiterates who are the

children of foreign born parents than any other county in the State of New York.

This may indicate how much more convenient the schools are in the city than in the country, and how much better the school attendance and child labor laws are enforced in the cities than in the country; but it also indicates that immigrant parents in the cities voluntarily send their children to school more regularly than do native born parents living in the country.

The facts clearly show that illiteracy is less prevalent in cities of more than 25,000 inhabitants than in smaller cities. They show that illiteracy is more common above twenty-five years of age than between ten and twenty-five. Illiteracy among children is rapidly decreasing in all sections of the country.

There is more illiteracy among women than men, but the difference is growing less, and it seems probable that before long there will be more among men than women.

Our American states are spending much more money for popular education than is spent by the same number of people in any other country in the world. Why do we have so many unlettered people above ten years of age, and particularly why do we have so many more than they have in England, Scotland, Holland, Switzerland, Norway or Germany?

The answer to this question is not very difficult. There are at least three reasons for it:

First. We are now receiving vast numbers of immigrants from countries where illiteracy is very prevalent. It has not always been so. We formerly got most of our immigrants from the more intelligent countries of the Old World. Now we are getting most from the less favored nations. Although there is no reason for fear that their children can not be educated and assimilated, both parents and children do add much to our percentage of illiteracy. But we get many immigrants from countries having less illiteracy than we have. One class somewhat offsets the other. It is hard to know what to do with illiterates who want to come to America from other lands. It is difficult, perhaps wrong, to deny them the privilege of coming, but clearly the matter requires much attention.

Second. We undertake more in our schools than other nations do in theirs, but the leading nations of Europe do what they undertake much more generally and completely than we do. In other words, in Europe there are classes and much caste. The people who have made and who execute the laws have not reasoned that

every child ought to have a chance to get a liberal education, but they have reasoned that for the good of the nation every child must be required to go to school regularly between about six and fourteen years of age, that he may be sure of an elementary education.

Third. They enforce school attendance laws more systematically and completely in many other countries than we do. Unhappily, the common sentiment of America does not sustain the enforcement of laws requiring the attendance of children at school, as the common sentiment of many other countries does. We have much more freedom in this country than many other countries have, but we have more false ideas about freedom than many of them have. There is the pinch.

Much depends upon the importance which in the popular mind attaches to the matter of sending children to school, and that in turn depends very largely upon what the government does.

I once heard a prominent official in Berlin say that he was sure that there were not ten children in that city, of a million and a half people, out of school that day who ought to be there. The necessity of having children in school has been inbred in the life and thought of the German people. All their plans were made to conform to it. The enforcement of laws or royal decrees for a long time has trained the common sentiment, and resulted in a universal usage. It is thought as necessary to have children go to school regularly as to have them eat regularly.

There is no doubt about the methods by which illiteracy may be reduced to a negligible quantity. It is to be done through complete statistics, through exact registration, through requiring that every child within fixed ages shall be in school—unless sick—whenever the schools are in session, through holding the parents more than the children responsible, and through seeing that every child is actually accounted for.

In the table of states set forth at the beginning of this article all the states before Maryland have compulsory attendance laws, somewhat, although not very completely, enforced. West Virginia, Nevada and Kentucky have such laws, very much neglected. The other states have none. Look again at the figures opposite the names of the states, and see the difference in results.

Experience is showing us very clearly what especial provisions must be placed in school attendance laws before they will accomplish their ends. Very briefly these may be enumerated as follows:

They must assert that every American child has the inherent right to an elementary education. It is a sacred right, which no one, not even a parent, may be allowed to defeat. They must require attendance of every child within fixed ages at school whenever the schools are in session unless excused for imperative cause by a responsible educational officer. They must punish parents with *fine and imprisonment* for not seeing that their children are in school.

It makes no difference whether the school is public or private. The public and private schools must cooperate. An up to date and reliable registration of all children is imperative, and every one must be accounted for. Nothing but sickness or disability or a death in the family or some overwhelming cause can be accepted as an excuse. Farmers have no more right to keep their children at home for farmwork or housework than people in the slums of the cities have to keep their children from school to sell papers or go begging.

Ample school accommodations are to be provided and evening schools maintained. School attendance laws and child labor laws must conform to each other, and the officers of the school departments and the labor departments must cooperate. Local authorities must have no option about enforcing the laws. And any officer of the school system or any public official who winks at violations of school attendance laws, or who refuses to enforce their penalties according to their intent, must be sharply punished for it.

To this end the common sentiment must be quickened. Surely the people of the United States are not willing to admit that we are permanently to have more ignorant men and women in this country than they have in other civilized countries.

Perhaps there is a factor in this problem that springs out of English and particularly of American history, and lies deep down in the nation's caution and self-consciousness. Americans are fundamentally opposed to any unnecessary meddling with their affairs by the government. They have always had great confidence in a resourcefulness which seems able to meet any actual peril when the time comes. They attach the greatest importance to the free chance for every one.

It begins to look as if it is quite as important to look after the rights of those who can not look after their own rights to an elementary education as to hold out to the few the opportunities for an advanced education.

If it is no more important, it is *as* important. And it will be a crowning glory to our republican system if the nation will put away its youthful vanity, submit with cheerfulness to the regulations which really enlarge liberty, deepen the common respect for the law by enforcing it, meet difficulties in practical ways, and make certain that *all of its children have the elements and instruments of knowledge* as well as that the stronger ones have the chance to scale the mountain peaks of learning.

A FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL PLAN NEEDED

REPRINTED FROM THE OUTLOOK OF OCTOBER 5, 1907, BY COURTESY OF
THE EDITORS

There is very little adaptation of instruments or of administrative methods to ends, very little that is expressive of professional experience and opinion, and practically nothing in the way of logical scheme, or comprehensive plan, or progressive outlook, about the educational arrangements of the federal government. Congressional legislation has ordinarily resulted from isolated and political initiative, and executive officers have resorted to expedients, both good and bad, to meet passing exigencies. It has never been understood that the general government had large or continuing educational responsibilities, and now, when it is clear enough that it has, the plans for meeting them are illogical and inadequate.

There is excuse for the situation, but none for not mending it. The federal Constitution contains no mention of schools. Aside from a brief and barren suggestion of a national university, there was, so far as we know, no discussion of education in the Constitutional Convention. It was not an ignorant or obtuse convention. Twenty-nine of the fifty-five members were college bred, and of the twenty-six who were not, Washington and Franklin were two. Six members of the convention were clergymen. The convention clearly assumed that, so far as education was a function of government, it was a function of the states. There were less than a dozen primitive colleges in the country which had been chartered by the king, but in each case it had been done at the instance of one of the colonies, and the resulting college had become the college of the colony and then of the state. Several of the state constitutions had already provided for colleges. State-supported systems of elementary schools had not yet been provided by law or established in fact, but things were beginning to move rather strongly, for in the next half dozen years definite and decisive beginnings in that direction were made. Wherever there *was* a state, the state had done and expected to do it all. Where there *was* no state, Congress felt responsibility and acted freely. Even before the Constitutional Convention the Continental Congress had, in 1785, reserved the lot no. 16, and one third of all gold,

silver, lead, and copper mines, for the maintenance of schools in each township which should be laid out in the Northwest Territory. And all are familiar with the provision in the Ordinance of 1787 for the government of that territory, that "religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." So it is evident that the very definite and common understanding at the time of making the "more perfect union" must have been that the federal government had distinct responsibility about schools and morals in federal territory beyond the limits of organized states, but that this function was reserved to the states wherever there were or whenever there should be organized states.

The practice has squared with this understanding. Congress has often legislated upon, and federal executive officers have never hesitated to act upon, school matters in the territories; never in the states. The United States government has several times made gifts to education in the states, and has sometimes made these conditional upon certain acts by the states, but it has never invaded the principle that wherever there is a state the educational system is a state system, over which the state government holds the exclusive and sovereign authority.

The United States government in 1867 created a federal Bureau of Education, which gathers and distributes educational information from and to all parts of the world, and has become a sort of clearing house for information concerning the schools for all of the states of our Union; but it has never been invested with the slightest *authority* over any matter within the limit of a state. The present object, however, is not to emphasize that fact so much as to point out that this organized and quite natural instrumentality of federal educational administration has never been utilized to meet the national responsibility for schools, recently much enlarged, or to propagate educational activities outside of the schools, in federal territory, and to inquire why.

Let us recall the situation which has grown up. In the territories of Arizona, Hawaii, New Mexico, and Oklahoma there are superintendents of public instruction, appointed by the territorial governors. The superintendents report to the Governors, who are appointed by the President, and the Governors make occasional references to education in their reports to the Secretary of the Interior. There is no professional and no located respon-

sibility. The Bureau of Education has nothing whatever to do with the matter.

In the District of Columbia the management of the schools is intrusted to a board of education appointed by the judges of the Supreme Court of the district. This board appoints a superintendent of schools. The schools are supported, one half by the district and one half by the United States. The Bureau of Education has no relation to the subject. Once, at least, when the school system of the district got into a muddle, the United States Commissioner of Education was asked to intervene and straighten things out, but that was only a temporary expedient in an emergency.

Congress makes annual appropriations for the schools of the Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Seminole nations in the Indian Territory, and the Secretary of the Interior appoints a Superintendent of Schools for the territory; but, again, the Bureau of Education has nothing to do with it.

The other Indian schools are under a superintendent appointed by the President, who reports to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and is under the directions of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior. The United States Commissioner of Education is allowed no official word concerning them.

A dual administrative scheme for managing schools seems to be deemed necessary for Alaska. Schools for white children and civilized children of mixed blood are under the supervision of the Governor, who is ex-officio Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Congress makes appropriations for schools for natives, which are subject to the Secretary of the Interior and are in some measure, at his pleasure, committed by him to the Commissioner of Education.

The Military and Naval Academies are wholly subject to the Secretaries of War and of the Navy, and no distinct school man carries the light of his guild into the recesses of their affairs.

The educational activities of the Department of Agriculture have been much expanded and accelerated in recent years. Through appropriations to the agricultural colleges and experiment stations the federal authority has already made rather long, but perhaps pardonable, inroads into old-time fundamental principles, but the Federal Bureau of Education has no word about them.

Perhaps, above all, the war with Spain brought to the people, and particularly to the government, of the United States, for the

first time, the difficult problems associated with the education of great numbers of unlettered people in somewhat densely settled territory under conditions wholly new to us.

As to Porto Rico, Congress provided that the President should appoint a Commissioner of Education who supervises public instruction and approves all disbursements on account thereof. The only function of the United States Commissioner of Education in this connection is that the law directs the Porto Rico Commissioner to make such reports to Congress as the United States Commissioner requires. The obfuscation assured by legally empowering an officer to define the reports which another officer with whom he has nothing else to do shall make to Congress is a novelty in legislation.

The general direction of educational matters in the Philippine Islands is committed to the Secretary of Public Instruction of the islands, who is a member of the Philippine Commission. The United States Commissioner, or Bureau, of Education has not the slightest official relation to education in the Philippine Islands. All the functions exercised in the United States in that behalf are vested in the Bureau of Insular Affairs of the War Department.

The educational system of Cuba was reorganized in some measure during our military occupancy, but it was exclusively a military matter.

The reason for the lack of logical plan about all this has already been suggested, but what is the reason why no one in position to accomplish things seems to have thought of the desirability of correlating the growing educational work of the government and giving it the advantage of guidance by the Federal Bureau of Education?

It can not be because the national bureau has been in inefficient hands. It has never been without a highly capable and efficient commissioner at its head. During all of the forty years of the existence of the bureau the commissioner has been a man of very high public standing, and nearly all of that time he has been one of the foremost educationists of the country. For the seventeen years just prior to the recent appointment of Dr Elmer Ellsworth Brown to the office, and while our insular cares were developing, the commissioner has not only been a man much experienced in teaching and in the practical supervision of schools, but he has been the sanest educational philosopher and the readiest and most inspiring writer in the country upon the widest range of educational themes. There were strong men in the office before Dr

Harris. The present commissioner was appointed for ample reasons. The staff of the bureau has always embraced many educational experts whose services have been widely recognized by the people who are best informed. The one thing needful to the bureau has been real school work to do.

The government has not been studying the logic of the situation. It has permitted itself to be moved by inexperience, if not sordidness, and it has met exigency with makeshift. The fact that the makeshift was perhaps temporarily necessary ought not to be allowed to develop it into a permanent policy. We were all proud that the American regular troops could temporarily provide teachers for the Philippines, and it was a distinct administrative accomplishment to secure a thousand teachers of pretty fair general average, and to transport them to and get them at work among such a far away people, without incurring criticism of the details of the heavy task. But even the powerful influence and excellent ways of Secretary Taft, who knows much about schools, can not transform the atmosphere of the War Department into a permanent stimulant to constructive work in education.

It is important to education in all territory over which the flag of the Union floats that the principle shall be firmly established that the spirit of the common school system bars all partizanship from its administration, and also that the proper organization and administration of the schools claim professional and expert service of a very distinct order. The educational system is not a thing upon which any party or class or sect can be allowed to uplift itself, and the administration of the system is not a thing to be held of minor importance and tossed about in divers departments which manage the conspicuous and imperative affairs of a great government. It is obviously as important that these principles shall be asserted in our territories and among our island peoples as in the already organized states. Indeed, it is much more important in remote federal territory than in our states, because in such territory there is not that public sentiment which quickens and guides and limits official action in educational administration as in our states, where American feeling prevails, and institutions have taken form, and the philosophy of our educational system is understood and accepted.

We have recently been reminded by Secretary Root that the states must do some things better than they are doing them, or the Union will have to do them from obvious necessity. The suggestion was timely and has attracted considerable criticism

without much reason, for it was only equivalent to saying that we shall find the way for doing what the better and clearly developed sentiment of the country deems it necessary and wise to do. Carlyle sums up the reasons for the failure of the Constitution of the Constituent Assembly of France in the words, "The Constitution would not *march*." The reason our Constitution has succeeded is in the fact that Marshall broke out roads for it and trained it in *marching*. But if it had "marched" generally as it has in education, it is to be feared that it would be taking a long and needed rest now. X

If we were to apply federal school policies to the State which is so proud of Mr Root, we would reduce the New York State Education Department to the function of getting information about schools when school officers are anxious to supply it, and to giving benevolent advice about schools when people will considerately come and listen. We would appoint superintendents of schools in our large cities through the mayors, and have them report to the Legislature through the Secretary of State, when they feel like it. We would annex the schools in the St Lawrence valley to the Agricultural Department, and those in the southern tier of counties to the Labor Department. And we would notify Long Island, stretching to the remote east and likely to be involved in wars over righteousness when the President comes home, that hereafter it will have to pay respects to the Adjutant General, and that its schools must begin to share supervision with the National Guard. In all seriousness, we would have to go back in the history of the State for more than fifty years, when the Secretary of State was Superintendent of Common Schools, and all school management, both local and general, was practically at one with politics. And no matter how far we might go back, we should find nothing to equal the inconsistency of having a completely organized, capable, and nonpartizan instrumentality for school administration ready at hand and refusing to use it.

We all know how inevitably the influences which are at the top of an administrative organization soon bear upon appointments therein and in time affect the conduct and shape the character of all who are connected with it. It must be so as to federal schools. This is not blaming federal officers. They are entitled to commendation for very good administration under untoward and perverse circumstances. The desirability of popular control wherever there is the enlightenment which may safely exercise it, and of the association of laymen with pedagogues in the manage-

ment of schools, is of course recognized. Even then it is necessary to observe the fundamental principles which underlie our educational policies and to effect the kind of organization and move upon the lines which experience has shown to be essential to results in administration. The business side of federal or territorial schools may properly enough rest with business officials, but the professional side ought clearly to be in the charge of professional men and women. The government of the United States has not yet got upon the correct lines of procedure in education. The reason is not far afield. It is found in politics and in officialism. Territorial governors, members of Congress, department officials, never wave aside any opportunity to make appointments, and when the occasion arises for the United States Commissioner of Education to contend with them about educational policies in the corridors and committee rooms of the national Capitol, the commissioner can not bring himself to do it, and he would seem weak indeed if he tried.

If the United States bureau is to be confined to statistics and information, it would seem better that it be not permitted to be regarded as an *administrative* or *propagating* instrument of the federal government at all. In that case it might better be completely made up of statisticians and editors, and constituted a section in the Census Office. It would there have definite and undoubted *authority to do something*.

But that is not what is needed. With a comprehensive plan, and concentrated administration, and actual responsibilities, the federal education office would attain such significance that it could get the attention of Congress and the country. Again, the experience of the government in dealing with one class of schools would be quickly available in dealing with every other class. The government needs, for example, to make a serious and scientific study of the whole matter of adapting our philosophy and practice concerning common schools to irresponsible, dependent, non-Caucasian peoples, and can do it more completely and quickly through a unified organization in which all of the conditions and all of the experiences may be brought to bear upon one another. Yet, again, the very enlargement of the national bureau through bringing together the number of people who are now engaged, at Washington, in looking after federal schools, would bring together, in time, if not at once, a much stronger body of educational experts; and it would insure for each interest, in large measure, the combined judgment of all. All this would develop

a new class of educational literature which would be of service to all the world. There is a distinct financial loss to the school work which the government is trying to do, through the lack of comprehensive plan; and there is a distinct moral loss to the nation, and to education the world over, because of the freakish and fragmentary methods which are being employed.

But perhaps a weightier consideration than any that has yet been suggested remains to be mentioned. There are needed educational activities outside of the schools. Libraries, study clubs, home study, are within the functions of democratic government. It is hard to set things right after they have got started in the wrong way. The farther they have gone in the wrong way the harder it is. The federal educational activities not only need to be related together so that they may support one another, and they not only need to be systematized and professionalized, but they need to be extended and sanely energized, made universal, and charged with responsibility for all manner of educational activities in all federal territory.

Why should our federal Union maintain at its Capitol an educational office without using it? If it is to maintain such an office, why should it neglect and belittle it? Why should it make the pay of the commissioner so small and his functions so insignificant that any man fit to speak for the nation upon education must suffer humiliation before he is allowed to do it? Why not have a definite federal educational plan, which is above partizan-ship, and an educational organization worthy of such a nation? Why longer allow education to seem to come after everything else in the federal scheme, when the conditions are here which ought to put it to the fore? Why not recognize the principles which are fundamental, and the policies which are fruitful, and the concentration which will of itself effect large and lasting accomplishments in education? In a word, why does not some strong hand that is able to do things go about a reorganization at Washington which will enable the government to increase its educational efficiency, logically meet its responsibilities to its new subjects, and at the same time set a good example to all of the states and all of the world? And what could be more fitting than that the name of the President who has really accomplished so very much for the intellectual progress of the nation should forever be identified with legislation reorganizing the educational activities of the federal government upon a logical, effectual, and enduring plan?

NATIONAL SYSTEMS OF EDUCATION

WRITTEN FOR *ENCYCLOPEDIA AMERICANA*, AND REPRINTED BY
COURTESY OF THE PUBLISHERS.

All of the nations laying claim to any part in the civilization of the world sustain some kind of a system of common instruction. This is not only true now but it has been true as far back as history runs. Even the pagan nations which have consistently defied civilizations have held and exemplified certain ethical principles, various classes of knowledge, and many interesting and expert accomplishments which they have taught to their young. Some of the nations which we would not quickly classify as civilized maintain not only schools, but schools of differing grades and in some cases they are related together in systems of very considerable organized efficiency. The civilized nations have all developed, either under public or private control, institutions comprising school systems, often extending from the kindergarten to the university, and in many cases they have added elaborately equipped and purposeful educational systems going far beyond the functions of schools. The monarchical governments have educated a favored class more or less exclusively, giving but the rudiments of knowledge to the masses. The democratic governments have opened schools and other educative instrumentalities more and more to all the people. We are to present here, in a necessarily general way, the salient features of these different national systems of education, and will begin with those of the simplest form and the least international pretensions, and later take up those which are more ambitious and more elaborately and expensively organized. The order of presentation, however, must not be taken to indicate any close or deliberate arrangement of these different systems in the order of their excellence. It is not practicable to present all, or to present any very completely, and the order of arrangement is not to be taken as significant of merit beyond the general fact that we begin with the simpler and proceed to the more complex forms of organization and administration.

China. China has undoubtedly maintained a system of instruction for the children of the higher class and propagated certain very definite philosophical theories for thousands of years. The Imperial government provides a system of examinations, but leaves the training to parents or guardians. Schools are mainly supported by pri-

vate subscriptions. The rich employ tutors for their sons. The girls count for little. The conditions of the masses are hard. Some classes maintain clan schools for their own children. Charity schools, supported by philanthropy, exist here and there. The best schools are conducted by the missionaries. The greater number of children are mainly without education. In recent years the Imperial government has established a university, a normal school, and a school of languages, and some of the provincial governments have opened colleges and military and naval academies. One province is attempting a system of graded schools. The whole school system is inchoate. Control by parents and filial regard for parents are national fetiches, regardless of the fitness of the parent for the exercise of control or for worship, and no duty of the state to the ignorant child of the masses is anywhere asserted.

Spain. Spain has a system of primary schools. It is supported by local funds. The municipalities are by law charged with maintaining schools but the obligatory provisions do not seem to be much enforced. Worse than all, there is apparently but little educational sentiment. It seems strange that a people with such a long and, in some regards, an heroic history — almost conquering the world at one time — and a people with so much artistic feeling and so many polite accomplishments should have so little educational initiative. But it is so little that in the absence of government support and compulsion the schools are disjointed and often superficial. So far as the scheme of the educational laws goes it seems well enough, but it fails in the vital points of application and compulsion. Primary instruction is divided into three classes, viz: first, instruction for infants between three and six years, elementary instruction between six and nine, and superior instruction for children between nine and twelve. The work covers the ordinary primary subjects familiar in America. Some advanced schools are being developed and in many of the provinces there are normal schools for training teachers. The teachers' salaries seem to be determined somewhat by the size of the towns and vary from \$150 to \$900 per year. In addition to the absence of educational sentiment and initiative there is the no less notable absence of higher institutions to give zest and guidance to elementary schools. A census taken in 1860 shows that 20 per cent of the population could read and write, that 4.6 per cent could read only and that 73.3 per cent could neither read nor write; a census taken in 1889 shows that 28.5 per cent could read and write, that 3.4 per cent could read only, and that 68.1 per cent could neither read nor write; the last census, taken

in 1900, shows that out of a total population of 18,607,674 there were 11,869,486, or 63 per cent who could neither read nor write. Here is an ancient empire with history and traditions, conspicuous position and great resources, with extraordinary culture of a kind, and with varied refined accomplishments, and yet the masses are in sodden ignorance. It is not because of the lack of laws nor because there are no schools. It is because the laws are meaningless, because of false views of life, because Spanish history, with all of its valor, has not made for true civilization.

Italy. In Italy at least one lower grade school is required to be maintained in every commune. Communes of more than 4000 inhabitants must establish a high school. Classical instruction is provided in about a thousand institutions and technical instruction in about 400 advanced technical schools. There are many universities, of more or less importance. The leading libraries and art galleries are extremely rich in their possessions. These institutions exert a very considerable influence upon the intellectual life of the kingdom, as they certainly do upon the culture of the world.

Attendance upon the elementary schools seems to be enforced, but it does not extend beyond the ninth year. The elementary schools are supported by municipalities. The character of the schools is looked after by government school inspectors. Religious instruction is no longer obligatory. Many schools are supported by the church, in which, of course, religion is taught. There are also many private schools established to serve one or another special end. In all of these the government requirements, which are not onerous, have to be observed. Education is practically free up to the university. Illiteracy is growing less. It is now about 35 per cent and has decreased by about half in the present generation. There are many schools for special purposes, such as art, agriculture; mining, business methods, etc. There are 150 training schools for teachers, with 20,000 attendants. The government does much for musical training. The growth of religious toleration in the kingdom and the added intermingling with other peoples are clearly aiding the progress of Italian education.

Japan. Japan presents probably the most conspicuous illustration in the world of the quick formation and the rapid evolution of a national system of education. In 40 years the Japanese people have passed from a chaotic educational situation to one very definitely, very completely, and very systematically and philosophically organized and administered. Where so much has been done in so short a time there is undue tendency to exaggerate statement and com-

mendation, but there can be no doubt about the spirit and purpose and plan and determination which have accomplished so much being entitled to the most enthusiastic admiration and approval, even though we distinguish the fact that the things accomplished could not, in so short a time and under such conditions, come abreast of the educational progress of some of the older and more democratic nations.

The elementary school system is practically universal, there being 27,000 schools in 1902-3. The attendance of children between six and fourteen is compulsory, and the people in Japan seem to be in the habit of doing as the law directs. In 1902-3 the attendance of both boys and girls was more than 90 per cent of the school population. Comparing this with the situation before the Japan-China War of 1893-94, an increase of 33 per cent in attendance in less than ten years is apparent. The attendance of girls is nearly equal to that of boys. The number of teachers is over 90,000. The schools above the elementary grade seem to consist of a half dozen secondary schools whose function is to prepare students for the Imperial Universities at Tokio and Kioto, and for various art and industrial schools. The universities embrace faculties of law, medicine, engineering, literature, science, and agriculture. In 1903 the number of resident instructors in the University of Tokio was 222 and the number of students 2880. There are many libraries and museums. Education seems not only to be pervasive but very intensive in Japan. The observation of other peoples by the Japanese is wide and keen, and they quickly adapt to their own ends whatever attracts their attention in other lands. The government has been accustomed to send the most prominent young men to European and American universities to be educated, but this hardly seems necessary any longer. However, the diplomatic representatives of Japan are exceedingly and uniformly alert in observing and reporting everything which may prove advantageous to the intellectual progress of the empire, and many special commissioners are sent abroad to study subjects of particular interest to the educational, military, and industrial activities of the Empire.

Perhaps it ought to be observed here that in Japan, as in all governments where the form of government is so extremely monarchical and classes among the people are well defined, some education may be pretty nearly universal while all education is not so. This is much, very much, better than nothing, but it is not all. The system does not open the higher schools to the masses, or at least it does not encourage the child of the masses to seek their advan-

tages. So much is ordinarily true of all nations where classes are distinctly differentiated. But it must be said that the educational system of Japan has at once come to be remarkably balanced and diversified. It expresses the traits and promotes the progress of a people with marked characteristics. The elementary part of the school system is not only universal but, better still, the mighty and conclusive power of the government is exercised to have the elementary schools provide the beginnings of learning to all the children, boys and girls alike. Since 1900 tuition in the elementary schools has been free. The training of the teachers is thorough, the discipline of the teaching force excellent, and the supervision is close and under immediate government control. The methods for enforcing attendance are effective and apparently there is no thought of evasion. This is surely putting monarchical government to its best uses and it is not for us to say that such a form of government exercised for such ends, over such a people, is not quite as suitable as any other.

Great Britain and Ireland. In England, Scotland, and Ireland we have our conspicuous illustration of a people who could set the limits to the power of the king, and establish government by the suffrage and under a constitution, without marked or general educational progress. From the beginnings of English history a small number of high grade universities with a few tributary fitting schools have trained the sons of the nobility, while the elementary education of the masses has been meager, precarious, and lethargic. There has never been before the present generation — if indeed it may be said that there is now — any common school system in England. There have been elementary schools, upon one footing or another, nearly or quite everywhere, and the habit of sending children to school has been general, but these schools have not been under popular control, and they have not led up to higher institutions. They have lacked in self-activity, spontaneity, and aggressiveness. As a consequence the masses have the rudiments of learning, and this, with the strength and balance of the native character, means very much. But the fact remains that because the elementary schools have really had no connection with the schools above, the children of the masses are without educational opportunity and the educational system lacks in national coherency, strength, and elasticity.

Why is this so among such a great people who have done so much for freedom and constitutionalism? No doubt the answer is found in the prevalence of ecclesiasticism, in the measure of control which the Established Church exerts over the learning of the kingdom,

and in the stubborn opposition of churchmen to forms of educational activity which are not at one with the fixed thought, plans, and ends, not of religion but of church organizations. Parliament has been struggling with this subject for generations. As democracy slowly advances to larger power in the parliament house and as the advantages of a free and articulated school system in other countries, and particularly in the United States, become obvious, more and more ground is gained — but the process is a slow one.

In England an act of Parliament passed in 1870 established school boards chosen at popular elections. The independence of these boards was very considerable and, therefore, their adaptability to particular conditions was marked. But by legislation in 1902-3 the local administration of schools of all grades was given over to the county, or county borough, council. Again the application of so much unification as this implies has been relaxed by excepting noncounty boroughs with a population of over 10,000 and urban district councils with a population of over 20,000, which the act declares to be entitled to control their elementary education. In 1891 an act was passed giving to every parent the right of obtaining free elementary education for his children between the ages of three and fifteen and as certain schools still continue to charge fees, the school boards are often put to their resources and ingenuity to find free instruction for all who demand it. Church schools are numerous. The conflict of interests between church schools and board schools, and between the adherents and supporters of each, is frequent, and the whole subject is a continuing source of acrimonious discussion and of unceasing educational uncertainty.

Beyond the elementary schools there are institutions of all kinds and grades. There is no organized system of secondary schools. As of yore the fitting schools for Cambridge and Oxford continue. The overwhelming, if not the fatal, defect in the English school system has grown out of English thought and history. It is that the universities and preparatory schools are to serve the aristocracy, and that any extension of these instrumentalities to the masses will unsettle and unfit them for service to the aristocracy. Accordingly, there is not only no settled and universal school system for elementary instruction, but there is no organic connection between such elementary schools as there are, and such secondary and university institutions as there are above them.

But this has not interfered with, perhaps it has promoted, the development of business and trade and technological institutions.

The defeat of British industrial interests in the competitions at world's fairs in the present generation has undoubtedly served as an impetus to the progress of instruction bearing upon the nation's industries.

A word as to the compulsory features of the English elementary school system should be said. By an act passed in 1876 attendance was first made compulsory and subsequent acts have made the compulsory provisions more stringent. As a general rule it is now obligatory for children from the age of five to the age of twelve to attend school, and they must attend from twelve to fourteen unless they are excused wholly or in part by reason of having passed prescribed examinations, or having attended with marked regularity before the age of twelve. In 1893 the attendance of blind and deaf children between seven and sixteen, and in 1899 the attendance of defective and epileptic children between the same ages, was made compulsory. Parents and guardians are made responsible for the attendance of children within the compulsory ages and are fined for delinquency, and employers who give work to children who are bound to be in school are fined heavily. The attendance laws seem to be very well enforced. Illiteracy is low. Exact data are not obtainable. In recent years only about one man in forty and one woman in forty have been unable to sign their marriage certificates.

No word of commendation bearing upon the historic English art and literary institutions, outside of the schools, which culture thought and give even added substance and warmer color to English character in general, and particularly to the classes liberally educated, is needed here. They are many and great—a good part of the intellectual instrumentalities of the world.

The Scottish school system comes nearer to that of the United States than that of England does. It has come down from the times of John Knox. It undertook to establish a school under a qualified master in every parish and made the maintenance of the same a charge upon the land revenues of the district. The influence of the Scotch Education Department upon all educational activities in Scotland is very considerable. This is the government department which administers government grants in favor of education, which prescribes the general lines of organization, and fixes educational values. It acts through inspectors or others charged with particular duties. The primary schools are general and they seem more often to carry their work into what we call the secondary schools, than is common in England. Coeducation in all grades is

common in Scotland and has been for a long time. The universities are strong and the Scotch character is strong. Many enter the universities from all walks of life. Scotch history supplies the reasons why democracy seems to be freer in Scotland than in England, and the results are obvious enough in the educational system. Still it must be said that the lack of organic connection — of the continuous road — between the elementary and the advanced institutions is obvious enough also, and it is of much moment from the American point of view.

Attendance upon the elementary schools from five to fourteen years of age is exacted, but some exemptions are granted after twelve years of age. The responsibility is placed upon the parents, and the penalties include both fines and imprisonment. In 1890 the attendance of blind or deaf mutes was made compulsory. The sentiment of the people combines with the efficiency of the government to make attendance general, and the percentage of illiteracy is low.

As to education in Ireland there is not a very great deal to be said, but so much as may be said is exceedingly hopeful. There are some Americans who do not realize what great institutions and what fine educational instrumentalities may be found in Ireland. These of course appear in the principal cities and they minister to the higher classes. The poverty of many in the country, particularly in the southern part of the island, is a great hindrance to the universality of the elementary schools. Yet the government grants have become relatively liberal and the determination to enforce the organization of and compel attendance upon the schools has become decisive in the last decade. The Irish Education Act of 1892 exacted the attendance of children over six and under fourteen years of age, but some exemptions are granted to certain children over eleven years of age. It was said with authority in 1902 that the compulsory provisions of the act were being satisfactorily enforced by committees in 131 different places. The general average of attendance is low but steadily improving. The government grant for primary education in Ireland for the financial year ending 31 March 1904 was £1,000,000 sterling. It may be said rather confidently that whatever work is done is as a rule very well done, and that the sentiment of the people touching education is steadily improving and highly promising.

If this article laid any claim to being a history, or even a very exact description of national systems of education, it would be necessary to go into an examination of the British influence upon

the intellectual life of the colonies and dependencies of the nation. It would be a profitable and perhaps a fascinating study. In several directions, particularly in Canada, Australia, and India, it would have a somewhat significant bearing upon world education. It is obviously impossible to enter this broad field at this time. But it must be said that wherever the flag of Britain has been raised, there schools have quickly resulted, and there order and system have led speedily to the generation of intellectual energy and to the diffusion of learning. Kipling's poetic reference is not without sufficient reason:

They terribly carpet the earth with dead
And before their cannon cool
They walk unarmed by twos and threes
To call the living to school.

France. There is a very completely organized and a wellnigh universal system of education in France. It has developed with marvelous rapidity since the Franco-Prussian War in 1871. It is hardly too much to say that it resulted from that war. In a great measure it did, but other contributing causes must not be lost sight of. It is an autocratic and in some ways a mechanical system, but it is autocratic and mechanical because of the necessities of the situation. It is a system which knows much of the history and philosophy of education and which puts to its uses the courses and the processes which the most enlightened educationists believe to be of the most worth in raising the level of a nation's intellectual and industrial capacity. It is not free from the incumbrances and hindrances peculiar to the political and religious history of the French Republic, but it seems to be freeing itself with truly spontaneous energy and elasticity, and the process has already gone so far that the danger of arrest or of retrogression has been practically eliminated.

The educational system of France has been marked by exactness, and the work it does is characterized by completeness. The state controls all. The Minister of Education is the autocrat of all things in the French schools. The differentiation of schools into primary, secondary, and higher is not only rigid but desirable. Next to the minister there is a director over each of these subdivisions of the school system. These officers are aided by inspectors. The educational policies result very largely from a higher council, a dignified body of leading educators, which meets twice a year under the presidency of the Minister of Education. The members of the coun-

cil are appointed for four years. There are 60 members. Thirty are professors and representatives of the advanced schools. Six are chosen by officers of primary education. Four, who represent private instruction, are appointed by the President of the Republic on the recommendation of the Minister of Education. Five are elected by the *Institut de France* from its own membership. Nine councilors appointed by the President of the Republic and six designated by the Minister of Education constitute the "permanent section," which meets once a week. With some appropriate division of authority and responsibility, these bodies lay out the educational plans of the Republic and exercise very decisive control over the satisfactory and complete enforcement of those plans.

The teachers in the public schools must be of French birth and must meet the requirements fixed by law. The private schools are subject to government inspection and direction. A naturalized citizen may be authorized by the minister to teach in a private school, but the exclusion of foreigners from even the private schools seems severe. There are more than 100 normal schools for training teachers, which practically supply all the teachers needed, and the system for examining and certificating teachers is elaborate and exacting.

The inspection of the schools is systematic and close. There are general and local inspectors in large numbers. The average is something like one inspector for 200 teachers, but by the increase in inspectors the number of teachers to an inspector is growing smaller. The inspection districts vary in size. The supervision of the normal and technical schools, of the manual training, and of gymnastics and military exercise is somewhat accentuated.

Coming to the schools themselves, it may be said that they exist everywhere. They are classified about as follows: (1) the mothers schools for children from two to six years old, (2) the lower primary schools for children from six to thirteen, (3) the upper primary schools and complementary courses annexed to the lower primary schools for children who have completed the work in the latter schools, (4) the manual training schools, with courses at least three years long, which receive pupils from the primary schools and develop technical, aptitude, completing the instruction of the elementary schools for pupils apparently destined for industrial life, (5) classes for adults and apprentices where the instruction has practical reference to the trades.

The elementary schools are free, even the books, paper, pencils, ink etc., being generally gratuitous. Even more, food and clothing

are sometimes provided. The expenditure for elementary schools is very large.

The work is generally excellent. It rests upon a philosophic basis and relates very decisively to the artistic tendencies which are always liberally present in the French people, and to manual dexterity. All the usual branches are well covered, with apparent emphasis upon drawing, work requiring the use of tools, the household arts, and music. Of course the outcroppings of militarism are often manifest. The branches which are simply culturing without manual labor are not neglected. The equipment of the schools, particularly in the cities, in apparatus and implements seems to be very abundant, and it is said that much of this is made by the pupils.

The aids to the life of the schools are very many. Libraries, art museums, musical institutions, are numbered by the thousands, and mutual aid societies, asylums for the unfortunate, and reform schools are too numerous to be treated with any detail.

The secondary school system is apparently attaining rapid development, but it is yet immature. The universities are many, strong, and yet growing stronger. So far as the writer can see, there is lack of articulation between the lower and the upper schools. It seems to be closer between the lower and the middle schools. Certainly the greatest emphasis is thrown upon the primary schools.

Primary instruction is obligatory upon all children between six and thirteen years old, unless in a particular case a child who is over eleven years of age is exempted by reason of his proficiency duly established. The instruction may be in a public or private school or in the family, but apparently the fact and quality of it must be indubitably established. Complete lists of children are continually maintained, and all upon the lists have to be accounted for. People in France are compelled to do things and they have got in the habit of it. Fifteen days before the opening of the school term the parent or guardian must notify the mayor of the commune whether his children of the attendance age will go to the public school, or to a private school, or be instructed at home. If the notice is not given the child is enrolled in the public school and the parent advised. Then the public school authorities must report on him. The only excuses accepted for absence are the sickness of the child, a death in the family, and some accidental and temporary break in communication. The penalties run against the parent or guardian, are sufficient, and the procedure is regular and as a matter of course. The percentage of illiteracy is not unreasonable and is improving. It is about one in sixteen, which, in view of the

really recent origin of the French school system as now rated, is not unsatisfactory.

The criticism which will occur to an American concerning the school system of France will relate to its *rigidity*. It seems to be the idea that the same thing must be done everywhere, and at the same time, and in the same way. There is lack of allowance for differences in local conditions. All children seem to be put through the same processes. The teachers are trained under a system which is exactly uniform. The freedom of the universities does not act upon the elementary schools. There is little local color through local freedom in organization and administration. The people themselves are without the advantage of administering their own schools. There are doubtless some advantages and some disadvantages in this. It is not a matter of election. It is a matter of history, of habit, of accepted understandings, and of outlook. The French system presents an extreme. Another extreme is presented in some of our American states. Very likely the golden mean is between the extremes.

Switzerland. There can be no treatment of the educational system of Switzerland, which is both brief and exact. The country determined upon a universal system of primary schools nearly a century before England took that step. The obstacle to a brief description is in the fact that each of the twenty-five cantons has its own organization, and there is not much legislation of general application to the whole country. The Confederation makes free primary education compulsory, but leaves the limits and details to the cantons. The Constitution forbids the employment of children in factories before they are fourteen years old, with the further provision that in the fifteenth and sixteenth years the time given to work, to the "continuation schools" and to religious instruction shall, taken together, not exceed eleven hours per day. This is important in view of the continuation and evening schools, at the latter of which attendance is often compulsory. The federal Constitution also requires all boys between ten and fifteen years of age to be instructed in military drill and attendant exercises.

The primary schools are nonsectarian. The different cantons are somewhat distinguished by differences in national descent and in church tendencies. Both the Evangelical-Reformed Church and the Roman Catholic Church are recognized by the state, but the instruction in the primary schools is secular.

There are six universities, at Basel, Zurich, Geneva, Fribourg, Bern, and Lausanne, with foundations from 1460 to 1832. There

are excellent academies at Freiburg and Neuchatel, and a strong polytechnic school at Zurich. The country is not at all lacking in libraries, art museums, and other stimulating incentives to learning. The different parts of the educational system seem to be correlated. The republican form of government gives an air of freedom to the whole which is not common in Europe.

The system for insuring the attendance of all children within the general ages from six to sixteen, with immaterial variations in the different cantons, is substantial and effective. The sentiment of the country supports the schools with remarkable universality. Illiteracy is practically unknown. Switzerland furnishes an excellent example to Europe of what a small republic can do for law and order and self-enlightenment as a people, and for individual opportunity, industry, and happiness.

Netherlands. The Dutch educational system seems to have maintained a very uniform growth from the dark days in the latter part of the sixteenth century, when the nation set up not only common schools but universities in celebration of the military victories over the Spanish in the first really great and prolonged war for religious freedom, which almost unconsciously led into political freedom as well. The system now embraces schools of every kind and grade, including good secondary, technical, and normal schools, and four state universities, which are ancient in origin and much regarded. Since 1857, and particularly since 1878, the instruction in the primary schools has been undenominational. Attendance has been obligatory since 1900, and the people who can not read or write are about one in forty of the population. The expense and management of the schools are divided between the general and the state governments. Institutions bearing upon the agricultural and mechanical industries are by no means lacking, and fine libraries, museums, and architecture, evidence, while they aid, a substantial and assiduous people.

Denmark. The educational system of Denmark diffuses throughout the kingdom a grade of learning very well suited to such a people. Primary schools are common but not free, except to the poor. Attendance is compulsory between the ages of seven and fourteen. Illiteracy is almost a negligible quantity. The established religion is Lutheran and it embraces almost the entire people, but other denominations are tolerated. Denmark seems to excel in secondary schools. Technical and professional schools are common. The country is essentially agricultural, and the fact is plainly discernible in the strong points of the educational system. At the

head of the system stands the University of Copenhagen. The Royal Library at Copenhagen has 500,000 volumes and is exceptionally rich in original manuscripts. There are two other public libraries in the city. Matters are managed very exclusively by the state, and the level of intelligence and thrift seems high.

Norway. The primary school system of Norway seems to reach all of the people effectively. It embraces a seven year course suited to children from seven to fourteen years old. It is a national system; is free, and attendance is compulsory. The distinguishing feature of the elementary school system seems to be a class of "ambulatory schools," which are moved about from place to place in the thinly settled districts. Beyond the primary schools the towns have superior schools of all grades and kinds. There are six teachers seminaries. At the head of all is the Royal University at Christiania, founded in 1811. The state religion is Lutheran, but all denominations are tolerated.

Sweden. There is practically no illiteracy in Sweden. The statistics show less than one illiterate in a thousand of population, and so much is said to arise from a few Finns in the extreme north. Of the conscripts in the army in 1900, 69.8 per cent could read "fluently," and 30.2 per cent "fairly well." This tells the story of the national system of education. Probably no country in the world gives more exact and persistent attention to education than Sweden is now giving. The Common School Statute of 1897 requires at least one primary school in every district. Where large enough, at least two grades of instruction are maintained, viz, an infant school for beginners and a common school proper for the more advanced pupils. In the former the instruction is arranged for two, and in the latter for four years. Attendance is, of course, compulsory. It must be from seven to fourteen years of age. The responsibility is upon parents and guardians, and the school board is by law bound to see that the obligation is fulfilled. If children are deficient of the required knowledge after passing the ordinary time in school, they must continue until they can meet the state's requirements. No obstacle—not the sickness or poverty of parents, not even the need of their labor to earn the family bread—is allowed to come in the way of every child being required to possess the elements of learning. If necessary, the child is given to the care of others and the expense forced from the parent or guardian.

The state pays exceptional attention to the defectives—the deaf, and dumb, and blind. This training is compulsory, also. Deaf and

dumb schools are established on a large scale, and the state bears the expense. This extends not only to the defectives, but also to the disabled.

The trend of education in the country seems toward training every boy and girl to read and write, to attend to household duties, and then to make useful things with his or her hands. The obligatory subjects of instruction are religion, the Swedish language, arithmetic, geometry, geography, history, natural science, drawing, gymnastics, gardening. The expenses are borne by national grants and local taxes.

Secondary schools also form a part of the public school system, and a national university at Upsala exercises a very considerable influence upon the whole. The system is ancient, substantial, and comprehensive.

Germany. For the long established, territorially extended, philosophically organized, capably directed, thoroughly accepted, and notably efficient, national system of education in Europe we must go to Germany. And if we were to undertake the exact study of any one system of German schools we must go to that great leader which embraces much more than half of the territory and population of the twenty-six German States which comprise the German Empire, established by the peace with France in 1871 — *Prussia*. This is not saying that the Prussian school system is better than any other in Germany; only that it is the oldest, the largest, the most comprehensive, and, therefore, the subject of the most interesting study.

The laws of the Empire provide for primary schools in every city, town, and village. As a result there are something like 60,000 of these primary schools, with 125,000 teachers and over 8,010,000 pupils. These schools are supported by some local rates and by much government aid. Parents are compelled to send their children from six to fourteen years of age to a primary school. One of the strongest points in German life is the very nearly universal and thoroughly established habit of sending the children to school. Compulsory attendance has been in operation for sixty-three years in Prussia. It is much for a mighty people to assume by common understanding that none but an imperative cause is to keep a child from school a single day when he ought to be there, and that nothing whatever is to be allowed to rob him of his right to an elementary education. This is apparently the case in Germany, and as a consequence the rate of illiteracy is diminished almost to the vanishing point.

Kindergartens are common in Germany, but are ordinarily if not invariably carried on by private enterprise.

"Continuation schools" are provided for the children of the working classes who want to do more work than is provided in the primary schools. They provide courses for two and three years and their work runs into trade instruction.

The regulations touching primary schoolhouses in Prussia illustrate the national estimate of the importance of educational details. Of course there are many buildings which were erected before the modern regulations were deemed necessary, and such regulations are not always enforced in Prussia, but they are quite suggestive enough. The building is to be erected in a sunny and dry open space, away from the most used streets. In the cities the interior of the block is preferred. Quiet is imperative. Good water is sought. Playgrounds are demanded. If the building has more than one story the youngest children have the ground floor. In building anew, provision must be made for enlargement. Every detail of construction is specifically treated. Use of new buildings is prohibited until thoroughly dry; in stone and brick buildings six months is allowed. The size of rooms is regulated; even the shape of rooms is regarded. So, too, is the size, form, and location of doors and windows. Heating and ventilation are specifically treated. The width and length of halls and the width and height of stairs are specified. The form and situation of desks; the height, width, and depth of the platform upon which the teacher's desk stands, and the need of hooks and pegs for hats and coats are all set forth.

Of course a national system which regards all these small matters touching the school accommodations, with reference to the health, eyesight, and convenience of teacher and pupils, can not neglect the details of the courses pursued or the sufficiency of the instruction; and it does not.

Secondary schools are found everywhere. Their work is varied but leans toward the classical, the culturing, the professional, and their line of cleavage is quite clearly a social one. Provision is made for the secondary education of girls as well as of boys.

Then follows a large variety of advanced special schools, such as schools for defectives, academies of forestry, polytechnics, schools of agriculture, of mining, of architecture, of art, and of music. There are more than 250 normal schools for training teachers.

Above all the rest there are 21 universities, some of them with just reputations which have attracted students from all parts of the

educational world. In 1900 there were 2800 teachers and 34,000 students in these universities.

The fundamental and distinguishing characteristics of this mighty system of education may perhaps be enumerated as follows: (a) the full and regular attendance of children of school age; (b) the habit of uniform obedience to the state's authority; (c) official exactness concerning the quantity of work to be done in each grade of schools; (d) uniformity in the work of each grade, with 42 to 45 weeks of work in a year; (e) the fact that each grade of school leads to something beyond, to work as much as to higher schools; (f) that the "something beyond" is suited to whatever manner of life the child is likely to lead; (g) the adequate preparation of the teachers, the exclusion of immature or unprepared teachers, the certain tenure of teachers, and the consequent dignity of the teacher and his work; (h) the inspection of private teaching and the assumption of entire responsibility for the education of the country by the government; (i) the apparently open opportunity for all, accompanied by a marked contentment with one's situation and a readiness to do what is reasonably within the reach of one's station in life; (j) a very considerable evenness of educational instrumentalities and opportunities in all parts of the Empire; (k) very many heights of scholarship which are not outranked by any in the world; (l) deep and common civic responsibility for the character of the schools.

In the work of German schools the ordinary work in American schools is included, but special emphasis is laid upon physical exercise and militarism, upon drawing and manual skill, upon needlework and other domestic arts, and upon music. Everything is done to nourish love for the Fatherland. The portrait of the Emperor is required to be displayed in every schoolroom. The national songs are sung often and well. The accomplishments of the nation are well told. Everything is done for contentment, for scientific scholarship, for industrial productivity, for military efficiency, for the happiness, oneness, strength, and greatness of the German Empire.

Mention of the important fact that religion is a vital part of the primary school curriculum of Germany must not be omitted. Whether the child goes to a public school or a private school, or is instructed in the family, the state demands that he be instructed religiously. If the school be one of Protestants, Roman Catholics, or Jews, the master must see that the religious instruction conforms to the religious preferences, and whoever gives any

instruction, including the religious, must have the authority of the government behind him. If the schools are mixed religiously, the instruction must accord with the beliefs of the greater number; perhaps in some cases the dogma and doctrine are somewhat mixed, too; more likely the religion is not so theological as some would make it. The clergymen are in a sense representatives of the state. The greater number receive a considerable part of their salaries directly from the state. They have been educated in the different grades of the schools, including the divinity schools of the universities, and are easily adaptable to the needs of German religious education.

In view of the purely nonsectarian character of American public schools and of the frequent discussion of religious training in this country, it is interesting to notice how the German law treats the matter. The following are among its provisions: The character of the religious instruction is determined by the father. Where the father and mother are of different denominations an agreement made before marriage to train the children in the religion of the mother has no legal effect. On the death of the father the instruction must continue in his faith and no deathbed conversions to a different faith are recognized. On the death of the father the court must attend to the matter. Children born out of wedlock must receive religious instruction in the faith of the mother. After fourteen years old children may decide for themselves as to the denomination they will affiliate with. Before fourteen no denomination is allowed to receive a child or permit a confession of faith other than that to which the child belongs by law.

The reader needs no assurance that a people doing so much for schools of every grade from the kindergarten to the university has accumulated many and great aids to information and culture outside of the schools. We know it would be so and that it is so. The libraries, museums, art galleries, architecture, palaces, mausoleums, and monuments of the Germans fittingly augment and round out their system of education, but obviously we can not enter upon even a partial description of them here.

Comparisons with the United States. The extended treatment which has been given to various phases of the American educational system in this department makes any general presentation of our own system unnecessary in this place. But I can not forbear observing that it is clear enough that there are some advantages and some disadvantages with us when we come to compare ours with other systems. Such comparison may be hazardous, but I shall

venture to express the thought that in regard for details and in a commonly exercised and accepted power to regulate them; in the appreciation of the necessity of universal and regular attendance of all children within fixed ages; in training for specific industries and common employments and in promoting contentment; in realization of the bearing of the work of the advanced schools upon the lower ones; in providing for the philosophical and exact preparation of teachers; in dignifying the teacher's position; in fixing educational values and in avoiding erroneous estimates of scholarship and culture in the affairs of the people, and particularly in determining the policies of the government of the nation, there are foreign systems of education which have claims superior to the corresponding claims which may be made on behalf of the American system.

On the other hand, it seems to me that in the adaptability of schools to agricultural, and particularly to pioneer, conditions; in such general inclusion of high schools, and now of state universities in the public educational system; in the steady correlation and solidification which is going on between all grades and kinds of institutions; in the continuous road from the lowest to the highest, and the encouragement which is given every ambitious child of the people to follow it; in balancing state and local control and in developing so much and such efficient local supervision; in the cheerful generosity by which the public schools are supported, and the monumental munificence with which private schools are established and maintained; in the fulness of religious toleration and the cordiality with which all classes from all peoples are working together for learning; in the elasticity and flexibility of the whole system, the freedom of its opportunity, the aggressiveness of its spirit, the grandeur of its outlook, and the measure of its accomplishments and of its confident expectancy; in the ripeness of its scholarship at many points and the tendency to diffuse and absorb scholarship at all points; in the growing regard for the implements and results of scholarship and the unlimited determination to have whatever will aid learning; and particularly in the popular administration of the system, the universal sense of proprietorship, and the retroactive influence of this upon the buoyant intellectual and moral sense of the nation, we have educational advantages which are enjoyed by hardly any other people.

WHAT THE WOMEN'S CLUBS MAY DO FOR THE SCHOOLS

ADDRESS AT THE STATE FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, TROY, N. Y.,
OCTOBER 30, 1907

I shall use no part of my brief time in the commonplace pleasant-ries which easily come to the surface when a man speaks of or to the Women's Clubs. I look upon you as the representatives of substantial women, who have organized for intellectual self-improvement, and are anxious to be useful to the towns in which you live and to the State of which you are justly proud. Your committee has asked me to tell you what an educational officer of the State thinks you can do for the schools. Most of you have attended the schools; many of you have children who have been, or are, or are to be, in the schools; and all of you know how vital the schools are to the town and to the State. Not doubting, therefore, the sincerity or the intelligence of your request, and well knowing how very potent your well directed efforts may be, I respond to your invitation with very great pleasure and shall endeavor to aid you with all plainness of speech.

In the first place, do not lose sight of the fact that all public undertakings in which both sexes are concerned will be better managed through the cooperation of both men and women. Their qualities supplement each other. If school boards were to be made up exclusively of women they would be no better than when composed exclusively of men, and probably, in general, not as good; for women are not, upon the average, as well adapted to public administration as men, and experience shows that after the novelty of the first admission of women to such boards wears off, the women who are less adapted to such places seek and secure places upon them. I have no objections to women in school boards, and there are many women whom I should much prefer to many of the men who are in such places, but it would be a false pretense, of which I should be ashamed, if I should tell you that you could help the schools by contesting elections and insisting upon sharing the responsibilities and the publicity often incident to membership in administrative boards. If you will use your influence to secure the election or appointment of decent and capable men on school boards, and if you will insist that boards, however composed, shall honestly

and completely perform their duties, you will accomplish more than you will by contending for the election or appointment of women thereto.

School boards often require prompting, and even insistence, from the outside about things which will need to be done. Public officials find it very easy to perform duties to which no one objects. It is very comfortable to receive the honors of a position without undertaking the things which require time, exactness, knowledge of the law, and courage, and which stir opposition and acrimony. There are not many vicious boards of education, but there are a great many which need to be told of things that need to be done, and ought to be called to account for leaving them undone.

The temperaments, tastes, and experiences of women lead them, very often, to see those things more clearly than men do. They can be exceedingly helpful in getting them done if they will go about it rightly. This is often so, law or no law: it is certainly so if the law intends that the thing be done.

All schoolhouses should be clean and sanitary, well lighted and ventilated. The housekeeping standards of women are higher than those of men, but none too high. You may be assured that whatever you may do to have and to keep the schoolhouses of your town clean and decent will be appreciated. If they are not so, put it up to the trustee or the board of education bluntly and publicly; and if you get no relief, publish your complaint in the newspapers; and if the appeal to local sentiment fails, write the Education Department to the end that an inspection may be ordered and such directions given as may be necessary.

Without any law or any official action you may hang pictures in the schoolroom and do many other things to make it attractive, warm the soul of the teacher, and cultivate the tastes of the children.

The law requires that every child under fourteen years old, and every child between fourteen and sixteen who is not at work, shall be in school whenever the public schools are in session. The trustees and boards of education are required to know of all such children in their districts and towns and to see that they are in school. Nothing, not even poverty, or the need of the labor of the child, or the wishes of the parents, is allowed by the law to deprive the child of an elementary education. Yet many a child is being kept from it. The percentage of illiteracy in the State of New York is many times greater than in Britain, or France, or the German Empire, or Switzerland, or Scandinavia, or Japan. Anything that you will do to support or force school officers to exact the complete attendance of

all children of school age will be a substantial public service. If they refuse after their attention is called to a specific case, you may be sure of help from the Attendance Division of the State Department.

You may help the elementary schools, at least, by opposing any more additions to their work before something is taken out. They are overloaded. I am not saying that the schools have been wrong in responding to our complex, present day life, but I have no hesitancy in saying that one enthusiast after another has added something to the work of the schools until, too often, we do not do what we undertake to do as well as it ought to be done; and yet the children are permitted to think that they know more than their parents do, when they are wholly without absolute knowledge and wholly unable to do anything with exactness. If you will resist further demands upon the lower schools and insist that their work be simplified and drilled in more deeply, you will aid in training boys and girls for more easily doing the work of the upper schools, or for earning a living if they do not go to the upper schools at all.

You may help great numbers of children, and your country as well, if you will join in a movement to overthrow the prevalent idea that success in life depends upon being lawyers, or doctors, or dentists, or engineers, or captains of something or other; if you will lead them to know that the greater part of them will be more useful and happy through working with their hands; and if you will aid in providing public schools, following right after the elementary schools, where the skilled vocations are made a reasonable offset for the literary, scientific, and professional work of the public high schools and of the colleges and universities.

You may help the schools by helping the teachers. You may help the teachers by being considerate and by sympathetic conference, quite as much as by criticism or by exacting special attentions which they can not give. The teachers of the elementary schools are all women, and are in nearly every case conscientious, often overconscientious. You will give them help and get help from them by inviting them into your clubs and by showing them the social attentions which they well deserve. Educational exactions which have been put upon them for twenty years, and the innumerable other vocations which have opened to women, have combined to make legally qualified teachers scarce. Yet the pay is small, often much too small, for the service rendered and the present day cost of living. Teachers ought not to be left to the necessity of asking or agitating for the support which is imperative to decent living. You may help

the teachers and help the schools by standing for such advance of salaries as will respond to the reasonable demands of the situation.

You may aid the schools by assuming, and if necessary by insisting, that no man who is not a gentleman and no woman who is not a gentlewoman has any right to have anything to do with managing or teaching in them. You will not be wrong if you reason that the men and women of the schools ought to have the qualities that will appeal to the better feelings and command the respect of the people; and you will be doubly right if you insist that people who can not appreciate the good qualities of a teacher shall not be allowed to humiliate a teacher because she is moved by the gentility which is vital to the schools.

I make no mistake when I say that the teachers want the help of womanly women, and the school system will welcome the cooperation of women's organizations. Yet I must remind you that every public school is only one unit of a general system of education; that its character and procedure can not be easily changed; and that you must be pretty well acquainted with the history and philosophy of that system, you must enter into its experiences and share in its purposes, before you can hope to be of substantial service in reshaping and recasting it for the better. On the other hand, let me say that if you do know that history and philosophy, if you have had experience, if you do know the difficulties, and if you are moved by rational impulses, there is no reason whatever why you should not take an aggressive course in making the schools better than they are; and even if some cherished cups and saucers should be broken there would be no permanent reason for crying about it.

You will not misunderstand me, I am sure, if I tell you that both men and women are needed in the schools, above the elementary grades at least, and you will be wisely aiding the educational system if you withhold your influence from any movement calculated to lessen the number of men who are teaching. The number is already much too small and it would be to the advantage of the schools if it could be much enlarged.

You may help the schools by insisting that they shall never be a football of politics. The man who makes political patronage of appointments in the schools is, perhaps ignorantly but none the less effectually, an enemy of the schools and a curse to the people.

If you are specially interested in the public schools you may help them by a friendly attitude towards the private schools. If you have alliance with the private schools, you may aid them through cordial relations with the public schools. We ought to know by

this time that no kinds of schools can thrive through a management which is narrow, exclusive, conceited or mean. Meanness defeats itself generally: it does with entire certainty in education. If you are specially concerned about one grade of school,—whether it be a primary school, a secondary school, a college, a professional school, or a university, you will serve it best by knowing the work and cultivating the acquaintance of all other schools. The educational system is knitted together and the strength of each of the parts depends upon the relations which it sustains to all the rest.

I take the opportunity of saying that the State Education Department will be glad to be of all practicable assistance to the Women's Clubs. Remember I was obliged to use the qualifying adjective *practicable*. There is more that we can not do than that we can. But we may do something through our traveling libraries, and through our standard pictures, and through our facilities for affording information. Very possibly we may be of service to you about many intellectual movements not related to the schools, but it is more than likely we may aid you in any rational efforts which you may make for the betterment of the schools.

In a word, I look with much satisfaction upon the expression of the purpose of your organizations to be the protectors and helpers of the schools. They are at the very center of your natural field. Be not afraid. Avoid sudden impulse. Look upon all sides. Be as judicial as a woman can. In any event, keep going ahead. It is not in you or such organizations as yours to do much harm. It is in you to do great good. Be assured of my wish to act in cordial and mutually helpful cooperation with you, and also of my appreciation of the courtesy which affords the opportunity to say so.



New York State Education Department

ADDRESSES AND PAPERS

BY

ANDREW S. DRAPER, LL.B., LL.D.

Commissioner of Education

1908-1909

ALBANY, N. Y.

305
D445m-D8-3500 (7-1898)

STATE OF NEW YORK
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Regents of the University

With years when terms expire

1913	WHITELAW REID M.A. LL.D. D.C.L. <i>Chancellor</i>	New York
1917	ST CLAIR MCKELWAY M.A. LL.D. <i>Vice Chancellor</i>	Brooklyn
1919	DANIEL BEACH Ph.D. LL.D.	Watkins
1914	PLINY T. SEXTON LL.B. LL.D.	Palmyra
1912	T. GULFORD SMITH M.A. C.E. LL.D.	Buffalo
1918	WILLIAM NOTTINGHAM M.A. Ph.D. LL.D.	Syracuse
1910	CHARLES A. GARDINER Ph.D. L.H.D. LL.D. D.C.L.	New York
1915	ALBERT VANDER VEER M.D. M.A. Ph.D. LL.D.	Albany
1911	EDWARD LAUTERBACH M.A. LL.D.	New York
1920	EUGENE A. PHILBIN LL.B. LL.D.	New York
1916	LUCIAN L. SHEDDEN LL.B. LL.D.	Plattsburg
1921	FRANCIS M. CARPENTER	Mount Kisco

Commissioner of Education

ANDREW S. DRAPER LL.B. LL.D.

Assistant Commissioners

AUGUSTUS S. DOWNING M.A. Pd.D. LL.D. *First Assistant*
FRANK ROLLINS B.A. Ph.D. *Second Assistant*
THOMAS E. FINEGAN M.A. *Third Assistant*

Director of State Library

JAMES I. WYER, Jr, M.L.S.

Director of Science and State Museum

JOHN M. CLARKE Ph.D. LL.D.

Chiefs of Divisions

Administration, HARLAN H. HORNER B.A.
Attendance, JAMES D. SULLIVAN
Educational Extension, WILLIAM R. EASTMAN M.A. M.L.S.
Examinations, CHARLES F. WHELOCK B.S. LL.D.
Inspections, FRANK H. WOOD M.A.
Law, FRANK B. GILBERT B.A.
School Libraries, CHARLES E. FITCH L.H.D.
Statistics, HIRAM C. CASE
Trades Schools, ARTHUR D. DEAN B.S.
Visual Instruction, DELANCEY M. ELLIS

New York State Education Department

ADDRESSES AND PAPERS

BY

ANDREW S. DRAPER, LL.B., LL.D.
Commissioner of Education

1908-1909

ALBANY, N. Y.

CONTENTS

	PAGE.
The Rational Limits of Academic Freedom.....	3
Desirable Uniformity and Diversity in American Education.....	21
From Manual Training to Technical and Trades Schools.....	44
The Democratic Advance in American Universities.....	54
The Adaptation of the Schools to Industry and Efficiency.....	71
The School Needs of a City.....	88
Suggestions to the Staff of the Education Department.....	103
Agriculture and its Educational Needs.....	110
Conserving Childhood	140
Lincoln	
1 Introduction to the Lincoln Centenary brochure.....	156
2 What Makes Lincoln Great?.....	158
3 The Moral Advances in Lincoln's Political Career.....	169

THE RATIONAL LIMITS OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM

ADDRESS DELIVERED ON THE OCCASION OF THE SIXTY-SIXTH CONVOCATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, HELD IN THE LEON MANDEL ASSEMBLY HALL, CHICAGO, ILL., MARCH 17, 1908

I have had the feeling that I was coming to the home of an old acquaintance. For ten years we were neighbors. In ways we knew not, we spurred each other to make them good, fat years in the history of university upbuilding in Illinois. When I was being urged to accept the presidency of the University of Illinois, and a few hours before the formal election, and in dread of what might be the possibilities of the event, I came to this university and met President Harper for the first time. If he had spoken in Hebrew and undertaken to examine me in Old Testament criticism, it would hardly have conflicted with what I knew of him, or with my very imperfect understanding of a modern university president. But he spoke in very kindly English, and you may be assured that he was not so unmindful of his diplomacy as to fail to urge me to come to Illinois. Neither presidents nor universities were disposed to flatter each other when events followed pleasantries and when the contacts were mainly upon surging fields of students in noisy contests, but the respect which I always had for his learning and his genius was in time enriched by the largeness of his heart and the obligations which were imposed by the tender of his friendship. And even then, Dean Judson was wont to say that state universities had the right to be; and perhaps he did more than any other to teach us all that the way to get rich in education is by giving, and that the sound prosperity of one institution of higher learning helps rather than harms another. So, as I come into the University of Chicago for a brief hour once again, there would be something unnatural, if not untrue, if I did not pay my respects to the memory of its first great president, and express my satisfaction that this university, so young and yet so great, maintains the pace and keeps the faith under a second president whose qualities and experience make him a leader of no ordinary worth to American education.

And I would not have the students of this university infer that my associations have been exclusively with the presidents. Many times I have been in the crowd which has felt the impact of your

stern and un pitying hand, and I have given my weak but willing support to the crowd which has often flagellated you. Mr George William Curtis once remarked to me that before he had the grippe he had nothing but contempt for it, but when he got out of it he had nothing but respect for it. The grip of the University of Chicago bears no comparison with the kind of grippe to which Mr Curtis referred, for no one can remember the time when there was nothing but contempt for it; but I suspect that we shall all agree that neither of these neighboring universities has ever felt the loosening of the other's grip in sport without a noticeable enlargement of respect for the strength and the skill which were behind it.

The candidates for degrees today may be comforted with the assurance that in their triumphant university hour they are not to be oppressed with admonition and preachment. I come to you with a little of the feeling of Dr Henry Van Dyke, who once said something to the effect that he stopped preaching to a great New York city church and went down to Princeton to teach the boys, because he felt the irony of exhortation or argument with veteran parishioners who had been many times saved or were apparently past all hope. Your new found veteran standing shall exempt you. Your degrees will evidence your secular salvation, and even though you were limping spiritually, as I do not suppose you are, benevolent words would seem commonplace today.

The theme of the hour shall be academic freedom and the limits of conduct which will let the truth thrive. The literature of the subject is prolific but there is no clamor in the forum just now. There has been no recent crucifixion without cause. There is no one in the stocks. There is no impending trial. There is no ominous raven on a bust of the goddess of wisdom above the chamber door. Freedom may be discussed with freedom. An academic question may be treated in an academic way.

The Evolution of our Higher Education

The development of college and university teaching in America makes a surprising and fascinating story. Looking for the mere statistics of it, we find none of much service to us before 1870, when the reports of the Bureau of Education begin to be available. Even in 1870 the classification was much less rigid than it has since become. In that year there were 369 institutions, with 3201 teachers and 54,500 students. In 1906—rigidly excluding all

schools of actual secondary grade, all preparatory departments, and all professional schools not associated with a university, but including the advanced technical schools — there were 508 institutions, 21,849 teachers, and 135,834 students. In 1880 the income of the colleges and universities was \$2,225,915; in 1890 it was \$10,801,918; in 1900 it was \$26,550,967; and in 1906, \$42,537,979. In 1880 the value of buildings and grounds was \$48,427,875; in 1890 it was \$80,654,520; in 1900 it was \$154,203,031; and in 1906 it was \$247,610,356.

It is not necessary to remind a university which has been a most conspicuous leader in this great advance, how little even these figures really express. To gather and expend this money honestly and beneficently has been a task of no ordinary difficulty, but to develop such a great throng of uniformly satisfactory college and university teachers in this brief time, we may admit between ourselves, has been practically impossible.

In this single human generation all of the essential factors of a unique system of university education have developed in America. If it is not better than any other, it is better *for us* than any other. It is within bounds to say that there is no longer need of forcing students into the foreign life which President Harper used to lament, in order to give them as scholarly instruction as is provided anywhere in the world.

We will not deny that, upon the whole, that system is different from every other. In this generation the sciences as well as the classics compelled recognition and forced their methods upon all the rest. They created colleges of their own. The applications of scientific study to the constructive and manufacturing industries came and made other colleges of their own. The higher education of women, upon an entire equality with men, and the carrying of liberal learning into numberless phases of the natural activities of women, made the men move around, and forced so much moving that some of the wise men of the East, with the best intentions and the utmost effort, have not yet been able to become quite reconciled to it. The imperative needs of the professions, and of a continually increasing number of professions, have taken up large tracts of university territory because they could not be met outside of the university enclosure. To make it possible, a great and universal system of middle schools, peculiar to the country, had to be established to connect the universities and the elementary schools; and such a system has been so highly developed that it is doing more

than the colleges did before 1870. Then the free right to get what one wants without submitting to so much that he does not want, and the liberalized methods of investigation and instruction, added overwhelming and often unmanageable features to the unfolding character of American universities. The obvious educational advantage to each college or school of association with other colleges and schools, and manifest economy, educational and pecuniary, grouped them about the same campus, while it added to the intricacies of life and the difficulties of administration. In a word, the offering of all there is in learning to all who want it and will fit themselves to come and take it, and the application of the higher learning to every human activity, has become the self-assumed and the measurably accomplished task of American universities.

Democracy and Unique University Features

This would not have been attempted, and it could not have been realized, but for the political philosophy of the country. But the political thinking which inspired the undertaking would never have accomplished it without putting into it two great factors which are essentially unknown to the universities of other lands. One is the board of trustees composed of educational laymen, chosen for their character, their benevolence, and their experience in managing affairs; and the other is the payment of teachers without reference, or often in inverse proportion, to the number of students whom they instruct.

Not many universities in other countries owe their being to private benefactions, or to the efforts of a representative democracy to work out its theories and prove its worth through education; and not many of them are sustained by means and influences which are most concerned that every son and daughter of the people shall have their utmost chance. The universities of other nations are expressive of the national intelligence and progress, of the national experiences and needs, and of the national attitudes and power. Beyond their revenues from fees they are but meagerly supported by government funds. Their internal organization and administration rest with the educational faculty or the leaders of it; and within the ordinary activities of accepted procedure they are unhampered. They undertake less than we do and perhaps accomplish some things that they undertake more exactly than we do. The means of expansion are seldom within themselves, however, and the external powers which limit their possibilities are themselves limited by

social, religious, political, and pecuniary conditions which those powers could hardly change if they would, and probably would not change if they could.

No one can fail to note that regularly recurring salary warrants and the absence of a system which automatically rids an institution of teachers who do not teach what is wanted, or in the way wanted, have a very decisive bearing upon the freedom and the expansion of universities. But the direct bearing of the board of trustees upon the life and growth of a university, while no less potential, is not quite so obvious.

An English or German university professor has only amazement at the presence of a lay court of last resort in the government of an American university. He holds it to be a limitation upon university freedom and a desecration of very holy ground. On the contrary, it brings into the affairs of a university a factor which makes for freedom and particularly for growth. Standing for donors in time past and in time to come, no matter whether the donors be individuals or a state, the trustees come into sympathy with the teaching, and add the factor which gives the institution very complete independence. It completes the essential elements of self-expansion. Ordinarily composed of men or women of representative character, the board of trustees regulates the business affairs of the institution and holds the confidence of the public concerning its needs. They are themselves sorely perplexed about its instructional and research work, but after their freshman year they realize that they have limitations of their own, and then matters run smoothly enough. The constant presence in university councils of representatives of the external world, to which the institution must look for support of every kind, and of which it must be a part if it is to give back an acceptable intellectual service, doubtless goes further than anything else to explain the wholly unparalleled advance of the higher learning, in the last generation, in this country.

Freedom of American Universities

However the matter analyzes, and whatever the explanation, these American universities are the finest illustrations of human power and human reason and human freedom, working together for beneficent ends, that the minds and hearts of men and women have brought about. They pursue their great courses, controlled by both centripetal and centrifugal forces, as freely as a planet

revolves about its sun. They exemplify free government in its most refined form because a university will be free anywhere, and here a university is in the midst of the freest government in the world. They stimulate every human interest and respond to every rational demand. Their very existence is wrapped up in their freedom. They attract munificent gifts of money and affection because they are free to administer them for the enlargement of human efficiency and good will. But their power is in their freedom to resist as well as in their freedom to do. Their moral forces are energized and their spiritual aims quickened because they are free enough to resist mere ecclesiasticism. They enrich the rich through intellectual association with the poor, and the poor through the same association with the rich. In their affairs men and women find the places to which they are entitled, and are thrust out of the places which they lack the moral and intellectual right to hold. The semester examinations are no more inexorable than is the sentiment of the campus. Always surrounded by politics in a state of eruption, they easily defy political intrusion and are expected to refuse to promote any political end. Giving instruction in every study, they try out educational values through processes which are unrelenting and by standards which will not give way. They make their own organization, they administer their own estate, they hold the right of initiative as to every undertaking, they may refuse as well as accept, and they have within themselves the men and the women, the powers and the means, of steadily enlarging their reach and of continually enriching their lives and their work. In sane and unselfish hands, guided by scholarship and by moral sense, they grow large because they accord with the prevailing opinions of the Republic, and their very enlargement, as well as their learning, makes for the freedom of the truth.

Basis of Academic Freedom

Fortunately something happens now and then to remind us that these universities are very human institutions. They are in the world; the people who are making them great are not yet ripened for translation. Their officers and teachers have been gathered quickly, and opportunity acquired suddenly is often misused. In his inexperience and enthusiasm, particularly in his unfamiliarity with the thinking and the pace of the Mississippi valley, a young professor from New York might forget that the intellectual capital of the ages may exceed the brief output of a New York, a German,

or an English school. And ambition, vaulting ambition, may impel a mere human to overlook the need of time, labor, and the forgetfulness of self by which academic preference may be secured, or held when conferred.

Academic freedom rests upon the same principles as political freedom; but it rests upon other principles also. Formal law is an insufficient basis for academic freedom. Mere inclination can not prevail in a university so much as it may outside of it. The associations of the academic body are freer than those in the civic state. The propriety and the possibility of that depend upon a clearer understanding of freedom and a surer capacity for it. It rests not upon legal obligation so much as upon generosity; not so much upon possibility and opportunity as upon the subordination of self to the atmosphere of the place and the common good.

Academic freedom is not for the teacher so much as for the truth. Scientific truth goes further than civic truth. It is distinctly higher than social truth. The Puritan doctrine, that he who hears untruth or partial truth and fails to rebuke it participates in it, has never prevailed and ought not to prevail in the civic state or in social life. All of the truth about the mere incidents of life, happily, does not at all times have to be spoken. Untruth about mere matters of opinion does not always have to be corrected. But the main function of academic freedom is the unlocking of scientific truth. There can be no academic freedom which is opposed to it. Scientific truth invites and stands the last analysis. There can be no compromise about it. Scholarship covets an opposition which reveals misapprehension or gives added significance and strength to the truth. The acceptance of alleged truth without evidence is bad enough in a university, but not quite so bad as the self-interest and conceit which necessarily protect it in the name of academic freedom. Academic freedom which is self-seeking more than truth-seeking is mere license and can not live in the academic atmosphere. Happily, it is governed by the higher law. It is an attribute of normal lives. One who can not safely exercise it may not have it; and from one who can exercise it safely it may not be withheld. It goes with one who can appreciate not only his obligations to a human institution—to its donors, its officers, its teachers, its students, and its graduates—but also the responsibilities of that institution to the constituency it is bound to serve, and to the world it is bound to enlighten and make better; and it departs from one who is so academically abnormal as really to put his mere liberty

of personal movement above the institution which gives him his opportunity, and above the truth which he assumes to think he is endeavoring to set free.

Universities Must Discriminate

Universities are very great, and very complex, and very human organizations. They have to care for property, they have to handle much money, and they are obliged to account in very worldly fashion for what they do. They must break out new roads, and they must equip themselves with a great array of educational implements; they must lay hold of rational educational theories, and they must have a superior knowledge of educational values. That has to be done through experts and teachers, for whom they have to assume responsibility.

The freedom and the accountability have to balance each other, or there can be no harmony and efficiency; and without these there can be no internal enthusiasm and no external confidence and growth. It all depends upon a true educational spirit which enriches itself by giving, and upon a balanced organization which assumes responsibility without limiting educational opportunity.

Our great American universities, above any others in the world, are forced to the necessity of discrimination. Their very lives depend upon it, and their peril is in the lack of men who can discriminate with justice and confidence, and who will not be turned from doing it by fallacious theories about freedom. Not only because of their youth, and their rapid growth, and the fixed compensations, and the permanent tenures of their teachers, but because of the universal ambitions and the intellectual traits of the country, they are at all times encompassed with difficult and serious questions; and they can not hope to meet the expectations and gather the confidence of the country, unless individuality is made to respect organization, while organization is moved by the academic spirit and responds to educational opportunity.

There are some spiritual educationists who seem to think that Garfield was assuming to describe a university when he said that a log with Mark Hopkins on one end and a student on the other would make one. He was doing nothing of the kind. His fine imagination was paying a fine compliment to his fine old college president. If there is one in a university who permits such an ideal to beat against the imperative factors of organization, it would be well for himself and the rest of the world if he would go out

and find a log, impress a student into his experiment, pass his hat for sustenance, and work his ideal out to a conclusion.

If there are minor disadvantages, they have to go with the superior advantages of organization. The mighty results of cooperative life and effort far outweigh any sweets which the recluse may gather by himself. The intellectual and the moral, the civic and the legal advances have come through yielding the mere independence of self to the advantage of living together.

Make no mistake. The trend of the world is not in the wrong direction. Individualism, the opportunity of selfishness to have its own sweet way, will have to reckon with organization inside, as outside, of universities. Organization protects against want and associates thinking with fact, energizes intellectual productivity, and gives scholarship its real opportunity. The laws of society and of organization will have to prevail. The organization, as well as the individual, has rights, and a university invades no sound principle when it maps out its own course, builds its own character, gets the best it can in scholarship and in teaching, loses no just opportunity to reinforce its strength, holds the good of all above the interest of one, insists upon good citizenship in the democracy of learning, and gives the world the benefit of it.

Process of Elimination

Now let us come nearer to the concrete. By a process of elimination let us see how little will remain about which academic freedom need be apprehensive.

Self-seeking must go out at once. Maneuvering for promotion or for pay, combining to control policies, and agitation to limit the freedom of any other officer or teacher in the institution, must lay no claim to academic freedom. A little of this is exceedingly repugnant to academic truth. If one will resort to it he must abide the result without any thought of making a respectable martyr of himself.

The choice of studies in a university is not wholly free. Certain studies are required to be taken before others may be. What shall be required is often a matter of opinion and it may be a means of abuse. It might happen that the weaker a teacher is the more preference he must have in the requirements. There are tariffs in university schedules as well as schedules in commercial tariffs. The arranging of schedules for favor or for monopoly is no more within academic policy than within the political policy of the country. If

one will indulge in it he must take his academic life in his hand and abide the issue.

Sensationalism has no rights of any kind in a university. Yet we must have learned that it is not to be kept out by the saying. Novelty of theme or of statement, suited to newspaper exploitation and to personal notoriety, are as repugnant to the traditions, the philosophic basis, the moral sense, and the freedom of a university, as illiteracy is a menace to government in a democratic state, or as greed is repugnant to fellowship in a philanthropic guild. One may not be allowed to propagate his vagaries upon the time and in the name of a university that would like to be thought prudent and rational. If one wants to be a professor of myths and ghosts, he ought to go out in the woods and sit on a log and pursue his inquiries on his own time and in the most appropriate place. Everything which lacks complete intellectual sanity and sincerity is not only without the bounds of the academic privilege, but is a menace to academic freedom.

It has occurred in academic experience that one has had credit for the work which another has done, or has transferred the responsibility for his own shortcomings. This may happen without wrongful intent, through subtle reasoning or lack of reason upon a subject about which one's mind is exclusive and intense. It is surely outlawed in a university, and it must be settled by the ordinary processes and standards of intellectual integrity.

Again, the mind of the scholar is jealous of the prerogative to do things agreeable to others, and utterly opposed to doing things which are against the interests of other people. Yet in academic upbuilding the bitter must go with the sweet, and responsibility must be associated with opportunity. When Seth Low was president of Columbia he said that the function of a college president was both to give and receive pain. Perhaps so, but that is no reason why he must monopolize the double function, or why his opportunities to give and receive pleasure shall not be as open as they may be through the ready recognition of his functions in college administration.

The processes of learning must operate freely, but they can not extend to every field of inquiry in one institution. There is no academic right to force an institution into undertakings it can not afford, or to extend processes once started to lengths which are extravagant in time and money, and unpromising in result. And there is no actual hardship about it, because experience shows that

the man and the institution who gratify inclinations without reference to the material cost, are less productive in new scientific truth than those who are compelled to square their work with the usual limitations upon human conduct.

There is less difficulty about all this in the field of the physical sciences than in that of the mental sciences. A university which would call back an investigator who is anywhere in the region of a grain of new truth in nature would cease to be a university, and the moment it was done the doors of every true university in the world would swing wide open to him. But when we come to the philosophical sciences, to matters of opinion, we will have to say that while the right of individual theory and expression is free, the right of place, and of association, and of time, and of opportunity, is not without its very decisive limitations.

There is scarcely an institution of higher learning in this country in which the Christian religion is not a matter of both philosophy and feeling. It is expressed in the life and functions of the institutions. Would the denunciation of Christianity and the propagation of some other religion be within the academic privilege in an institution founded upon, and nurtured by, Christianity? There are differing philosophical attitudes and different understandings of history, concerning Christianity. Would an interpretation of history and a theory of religion consonant with Protestantism, be within the academic privilege at the Roman Catholic University at Washington, and would such interpretation and such theory be without that privilege at Yale?

All of our higher institutions are chartered by, and many of them are supported by, a democratic state. Would the contention that democracy is a vicious system, or that all government is an improper constraint upon the governed, be within the rights of free teaching in one of these institutions? May theory pull down the roof that shelters it? May a mere doctrinaire overturn the fundamental political philosophy which has been worked out in this country by hard thinking, by consecration, and by blood?

Even Germany does not allow that, and it well may be doubted whether the United States ever will go, or ought to go, as far as Germany does in regard to what teachers teach, and what students do in the name of "scholarship," without reference to the balanced character and moral fiber which we hold to be vital to its genuineness and its worth.

There is little difficulty about what shall be taught in the schools,

or the freedom with which it shall be taught, until we come to topics which, for the time being, are subjects of party warfare. And there is no ground for difficulty about those if teachers observe the reasonable proprieties of the teacher's office. That office is not that of the advocate; it is not that of the agitator; it is not that of the executor; it is not that of the legislator. It certainly is not that of the dictator. It is that of the judge. Its function is to ascertain and enlarge and expound the truth. It must do that judicially. It may be well to observe that there is no other judicial power in the organization of a university than what inheres in the essential attributes of its officers and teachers. The university has the powers of determination, and expression, and propagation, and expansion, wholly within itself. Beyond all other human institutions the American university is without limitations. There is no court to say that any educational policy of the corporation is in conflict with the constitution, and therefore void and of no effect. And we are easily able to "construe" all formal words that relate to education in ways which easily paralyze the profane minds which are not acclimated to the atmosphere of the universities.

Upon what may be called "live questions" we are dependent upon the judicial sense, the good breeding, the common sense, the sense of the proprieties, and the sense of humor, of the teacher. Happily, he fails us in only one case in a thousand. In the exceptional instance the sense of others comes to his rescue. There is no limitation whatever upon the sincere effort of such a one to ascertain the truth or to express his conclusions as to what is the truth. The intelligence of the country would sharply resent any interference with such effort or such expression within the well understood conventionalities of the professorial office.

But as there are conventionalities which one must observe in order to be a judge, so there are those which one must observe in order to be a teacher, certainly in order to be a university professor. For common example, a professor of economics may believe in international commercial freedom of trade. It is a mere matter of opinion. He has the clear right to express his opinions, but surely he has no right to enforce them upon students without telling them of the objections and the arguments upon the other side. Indeed, an intellectually honest man in such a situation will be specially careful to elucidate all the contentions of those who believe in protection, because he does not agree with them. I can have no valid objection to a professor being a free trader. I can not object to

his telling students the reasons why. But I have abundant reason for objecting to his hiding from students the arguments which support the policy of protection, and to his enforcing his partizan view upon mere youth with the ponderous solemnity and entire certainty of a military execution.

Again, there are limitations upon the time and place for the proper exercise of the professorial, as of the judicial, office. These limitations aid rather than destroy the mental balance. One who would appear upon the hustings and say, "I am a judge. I have been elected. I have taken the office. I know the law, and the right of this matter is thus and so," would divest himself of all right to respect, and his office of all right to prerogative and power. He must sit upon the bench; he must have jurisdiction; he must have an issue properly joined; he must give the parties in interest their day in court; he must hear the contending views patiently; he must determine only what he has the right to decide, and he must do that without bias, with deliberation, and with dignity, if he expects to give potency and effect to his judicial office. The professor, no less than the judge, is in quest of the right and of the truth. To have result, or to have weight, his quest must be within the domain of his professorship, must be pursued with an open mind, and must be conducted with a scrupulous regard for the amenities of his office. Standing for his science and for the truth, and for the university which gives him his right and his opportunity, he may reasonably be expected to refrain from conduct which, in the judgment of responsible authority, is not compatible with either. ✓

But suppose he is unable to see that it is not the freedom of teaching, but only the misconception of the teacher, which is involved. If he is worthy of a university, the matter will correct itself in time, and more than the requisite time is always allowed; if unworthy, he will assert misuse, and have things said, and invoke sympathy, and perhaps enjoy "martyrdom." He will have the newspapers and educational journals largely to himself. The presidents and trustees of colleges and universities will doubtless have enough to answer for, but there is reason to believe that it will be well atoned for by the truths they might have told but considerably kept to themselves. But shall there be no determination? There are those who say, "Let it all go: it is the price we must pay for academic freedom." The price may be wholly unnecessary or far too high. May one promulgate as truth mere opinions which are

not sustained by the body of his colleagues in his branch of study? May he proclaim to the public as discovered truth that which is still hidden? May he propagate partizan views and possible untruth in his classroom indefinitely and without hindrance? May he employ sensational methods to attract attention? May he assume to speak authoritatively upon subjects foreign to his own? May he bring ridicule upon his university by going to the world upon propositions about which he has had no experience? May he outrage the rights and reasonable expectations of students, and subject donors and trustees and colleagues and alumni to humiliation? May he do all this and more, and there be no proper remedy? The sense of the world, even of the academic world, will not assent to it. If honest, give him time, and consideration, and perhaps opportunity for a "call" to some other place. There will be some solution. If his intellectual integrity limps, give him the admonition of the saints and the prayers of the congregation. Paul adjured the Thessalonians that they should "study to be quiet," and to such a professor a sermon on that text might well be preached. If nothing else avails, submit the matter to the sound discretion of the board of trustees, and pray that they will not allow fear or favor to interrupt the high purposes which a discriminating Providence had in view when it disposed that they should be trustees.

University Forces in Equilibrium

Our democracy is developing a unique system of education in America. It is bringing out a type of university peculiar to the country. There can be no university without scientific teaching. There can be no great university without teaching that is scholarly, free, and aggressive. But there will never be a university strongly sustained in this country in which balanced sense does not combat unscientific teaching.

And we may safely go further and say that an American university must be the home of other things than mere scientific research. It will not be projected in a groove; it will not be based upon a single idea; it will not consent to serve a single interest. An American university will have to give free play to the political philosophy of the nation. It will have to stand for character as well as scholarship. It will have to be the conscience as well as the brains of its constituent factors. Opposing points of view are vital to the unlocking of the *whole* truth, and opposing intellectual forces will have to enter into the training in moral sense and manliness and

womanliness, which the Republic claims for her college youth. There is more danger to the future of some American universities through the fettering of administrative, than of academic, freedom. And there will never be a representative American university, with virile and growing power in it, where the forces which are essential to self-expansion and to its representative character are not all present, are not held in common respect, and do not balance one another in rational equilibrium.

Those forces are the public, the donors, the trustees, the president, the teachers, the students, and the alumni. Each is to have its independence. Each is to be aggressive. None is to trench upon the independence of any other. Each is to regard the fundamental principles and the imperative limitations of cooperative and organized effectiveness. There is no cause for conflict which is not alien to a university and which in an institution worthy of the name will not in due time and by natural processes be pushed into its subordinate and impotent place, or forced out of the fellowship. In a university, as nowhere else, selfishness defeats its own ends. Generosity and truth fit together, and where they join forces learning will be uplifted, and multitudes of men and women will gather about its home.

The freedom of American sentiment, the history and traditions, the temperament and ambitions, the moral fiber and sense of humor, the indifference to hurts and confidence in the future, the feeling of common proprietorship and the exactions of common sense, are all mighty forces in the evolution of a university which can endure in the United States.

President Hyde, of Bowdoin, in one of the best magazine articles to be found in the literature of this subject, sounds one note that seems to me discordant. Speaking of the donor, he says, "He may give or he may not give. After he has given he has no rights." I can hardly think that he meant to say that a man with millions, which he can never use except by giving, is quite as free not to give as he is to give; and I hesitate not a moment in saying that after one has given, his rights to the realization of his expectations are as fixed as law and as sacred as honor can make them. Doubtless the intent was to say that we may accept or we may not accept. A university will not accept an absurd bequest, and it is powerless to accept an unconscionable one. But obviously the best practical realization of a donor's thought is vital in a country where univer-

sities have grown out of beneficence in a way and in a measure wholly new to educational history in the world.

All interested in a university are the moral custodians of the trust, but the trustees are also the legal custodians of it. We have already noted the peculiar advantage which a university derives from having all the factors of government and of expansion within itself. We have so complete and independent an entity that we seldom think of the limitations which must necessarily follow exclusive external control by parliament or minister. The American university board of trustees is itself at all times under the spell of the university. It is an influence so elevating and enlightening that it beautifully balances that commercial sense and worldly sagacity which are the first requisites of the office of trustee. But it ought never to be forgotten that the opportunity of the true teacher and the health of the institution depend upon the freedom of the trustee from bias, from maudlin sympathy, from fear, and from selfishness, quite as much as upon any other freedom which is bound to find its home in a university.

The presidency, like the trusteeship, has developed in, and is peculiar to, the American universities. It is the essential executive office, the logical product of the necessities of such an organization. The president does not legislate and he does not appoint or promote teachers. But he holds the educational initiative. All experience shows that it can not be reposed in a board. It is inconsistent with the legislative function. If he holds it safely, if his outlook is clear, and his sense just, and his purposes will not be turned aside, and if he is sustained, the university waxes strong and great. If not, his administration fails. He must be a great leader in education, and he must hold many interests in equipoise. He can not lead and he can not bind many interests together in an effective whole unless justice and patience and steadiness and firmness abide with him and he keeps his administrative freedom under his own hat. And fortunate is an institution which has found the man who can do that; and more fortunate still is the university which has come to see that the freedom of all will be enlarged by making it easy, rather than hard, for him to lead when he has proved that with reasonable support he is able to lead.

The teacher who seeks and uplifts the truth will have in this country a measure of freedom larger than that of any other country, to the accomplishment of his end. If he can not do it in one place, there will be plenty of other places where he may. If one

man opposes him, there will be plenty more to give him a helping hand. The measure of his support will be in very close proportion to the sincerity of his purpose and the intellectual sanity and integrity of his effort. But I accept no theory concerning the relations, no rule concerning the treatment, of a teacher, which does not make him a well rounded, independent, manly, attractive character, who asks no special privilege and avoids no ordinary obligation.

The just freedom of the student is as sacred as that of any one else in the university. Like all others he is responsible to law and order. If he violates the penal code he should suffer its penalties. If he dishonors the institution, he should be excluded from it. The modern enlargement of his freedom has made him a better, a stronger, and a juicier character than he used to be. In his quest for learning he is just as free as the teacher. The freedom of the student is often the main assurance of the virility of the teaching. He must know that somewhere in the institution there is a court of last resort that will give him justice, no matter who is involved.

And any course which would repress the free word of the alumni in the affairs of a university would certainly be a fatuous one. Of course, they may not have thrown off their student feelings or departed altogether from the student point of view, but their word may be no worse on that account; and whether it is or not, the heart beats of the great organization will quicken a little when it is spoken.

If the guardianship of law, through the protection of powers and the enforcement of limitations, by the judiciary, is the greatest contribution of America to the science of politics, as Secretary Root has said; then the guardianship of truth in every branch of human study, through the amplitude of powers, the balance of forces, the freedom of procedure, and the limitations upon mere human inclinations in American universities, may yet prove to be the greatest gift which America will make to world education.

There are no limitations upon learning in the United States. Ecclesiasticism, monarchism, militarism, officialism, or tyranny of any other kind, will never be allowed to get in the way of education in this country. Every grade of school will be open to every moral, intellectual, and industrial interest of every man and woman in the land. But there will never cease to be limitations

upon men and women who are promoting learning. Limitations are what earnest men need and what great men impose upon themselves. University courtesy may be a hindrance to the truth and a curse to teaching. When academic freedom is permitted to further the merely human inclinations, it is more than likely to thwart the interests of learning. The truth will have to be unlocked and transmitted through diligence, and patience, and self-abnegation, and love of men, and love of the truth, and the compensation for the service will have to be in the gold coin of heaven.

DESIRABLE UNIFORMITY AND DIVERSITY IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

ADDRESS BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF SUPERINTENDENCE OF THE
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY
26, 1908

I can scarcely begin without mention of the fact that my entrance into the affairs of the National Education Association was twenty years ago, in this month, in this department, and in this city. It was the beginning of personal, professional, and official relations which have been a constant satisfaction to me. I had the temerity to present a paper on determining the qualifications of teachers. It took ground for state regulation, for the subordination of local methods to a state system which would at least protect every district against the relatives, and dependents, and supporters, and adherents, of school officials, unless they could pass examinations and teach; but it stood for the freedom of all who could stand up among men and women and exercise freedom without harm. If any one should recall that it was a bit crude, he will at least do me the favor of remembering that the speaker was then very young. Crude or not, it started an intellectual and pedagogical ruction in the department. But what provided the basis for a very earnest discussion then, is everywhere accepted now, unless it be in isolated sections which I lack the hardihood or the courage to mention.

The next year at Nashville I became president of the department. The record sets forth that sixteen votes were thrown for me, that fourteen went for Mr Moffett of Alabama, that there were eight scattering, and that an open resolution, without a ballot, was required to effectuate my election. Mr Moffett was considerate enough to join in the conclusion very heartily, and I held the office. The next year, with a much larger attendance, I was continued with every expression of unanimity, and the New York and Philadelphia meetings of the department are among the grateful memories of my association with the doings of the schools. I should therefore be false to much that I cherish, and descend to the depths of ingratitude, if I were not to respond heartily to your invitation to present this address.

Growing Uniformity

In the last twenty years the growth of uniformity in the plans and policies of the schools has been marked. We all know the reasons. In part they are internal and in part external. We are good travelers and great readers. We are all moved by the same ambitions. We would have as efficient and progressive schools as any people have. We are moved by the very uniform, and certainly the almost universal, advances in the thinking and the doing of the country. We have gained in bigness and in weight, and the inertia which oppressed us before there was a great ball to roll has given place to the new difficulty of safely applying the tremendous energy of a mighty ball in motion. Rejecting the attitude of a wise old man apprehensive about something new, and without pessimism, of which I have not a grain, I am going to query to-night whether our information is not more general than our discrimination in its applications, whether the diversity in our situations ought not to play a freer part in the determination of our policies, and even whether we ought not to be upon our guard against a uniformity of educational organization which may either overreach or fall short of the educational need of imperative situations. And, notwithstanding the difficulty of the task, I am going to try to reason out and lay down some propositions upon which we may stand concerning desirable uniformity in the logic, and diversity in the instrumentalities, of American education.

Illustrations in Uniformity

A dozen years ago the president of the University of Illinois had some small part in securing the appropriations for a fine new library building, and then indulged in some pardonable reflections about where it should stand. It was his first experience in the matter of placing buildings in Illinois. He reasoned that it might well be placed so that it would "quarter" a little upon the course of the sun, so that the rather plain stack rooms in the rear might be as unobtrusive as possible, and so that the front, when taken in connection with other buildings, might present a sort of crescent to the main entrances to the grounds and add a little oneness and warmth of feeling to what the architects call "the ensemble." He figured it out, had the plat staked out on the exact ground where all this might be accomplished, and made it all very graphic by causing ropes to be strung around the stakes, so that none could lose the effect. He procured the governor to come and look, and

the great head of the state said it was "good." He led the board of trustees to the scene and exploited to them the sentimental magnificence of the prospect. He could not fail to observe that they appeared to have some latent doubts about the matter, but he noted with satisfaction equal to his appreciation of their goodness, that their skepticism was suppressed by their consideration for himself. Returning to the council chamber, they too, in formal resolution, pronounced it all "good." Then, at high noon of the next day, there was an alumni feast which was attended by revelry and mirth and much freedom of talk. In the midst of the hilarity one unsubmissive unregenerate got up and said only this and nothing more: "Before the trustees break ground for that library building, it is to be hoped that they will have sense enough to pull it around square with the world"; and the uproarious acclaim which he evoked drove the information into the soul of the president that his ambitions and ideals about landscape gardening and architectural effect were being quickly prepared for a peace offering to the Illinois reverence for the cardinal points of the Illinois compass. His later information was correct. The ceremony was marked by a sympathy for the sacrifice, but by entire firmness and determination; and that building stands upon an exact east and west line with its beautiful face squarely turned toward the mathematical but evasive great north pole, with what seems to me a serious and worried look because the curvature of the earth defeats its eternal effort.

Yet it was well. It is seldom that anything in which we are interested is as important as it seems to us at the time. It was better that the building should conform to common and harmless thought, than that it should for all time be obliged to encounter the universal standards of its owners about the fitness of things.

There are some things that are not likely to be changed. The highways of New England will always follow the streams, seek the easy grades, wind about the mountains, and be grateful for the woods, no matter how long, or how crooked, or how heavy, the road may be. The highways of the prairies will always be as straight as an arrow, exactly a mile apart, both north and south and east and west, and they will never get in conflict with magnetism nor with mathematics. But in each case they advance on lines of least resistance, and adjust the advantages of the situation to the uses of the people. There are usages or whims, as well as mountains and streams, which can not be changed. In the ceme-

teries about my New York home the graves are laid with reference to the size of the lot, and the trees that are upon it, and the number who are to occupy it, and without much thought of where the sun rises; but about my Illinois home the dead are laid on east and west lines, with the head to the west, so that when the trump of the archangel shall sound the sleeper shall sit up and look to the east, lose no time in the bewilderment of turning around, and suffer no prejudice in the preferences of the Eternal Kingdom. It is better to conform to it than to be distressed by futile attempts to reform it. Preaching is a good thing, but much of it is wasted because irrational, unspiritual, or aimed at the unchangeable. Uniformity is often a good thing, but it will find its match in the Yankee notions of Connecticut. Multiforimity is often a good thing, but diversified agriculture will not stir enthusiasm among the wheat growers of Minnesota and the Eastern Dakotas, nor among the corn growers of Illinois and Iowa, nor among the cotton growers of Georgia and Alabama.

Ignorance is unpardonable. Information comes easily. But what is well depends upon conditions. Reason must deal with facts. Policies must adapt themselves to situations. No matter how informed one may be about a movement which has somewhere been successful, no matter how contagious is his enthusiasm; no matter how good the motive; it is all wasted if the thing can not go where it is to be tried, or if it must cost in one way or another more than it can come to. If time is of no value, if energy is not occupied, if novices or geniuses are only wandering in intellectual forests and wondering about game, there is no harm; there may be possible good. But seasoned and intensive lives can not wait upon mere possibilities; certainly not upon those that are too remote. Even discovery and invention have come from lives that were balanced and intense, that evolved theories that are rational, and that followed probabilities that were at least within the realm of realization. And no matter how much we owe to research, to discovery, or to invention, the world's work has been borne and the world's advance has been made by men and women who are able to see *what may be done*, and who have the force and the discrimination which can do it.

No Obstacles to Education

Education comes pretty near being the American universal passion. All the people believe in it. If that is not literally true it is so near it that no one can disbelieve in it without ostracism. If

one is indifferent to it, it is because he is a mental toper or an intellectual degenerate. All the people believe in all the people having all they will take of it. If there is one who does not it is because he is un-American, out of sympathy with the fundamental philosophy of the nation. All the people believe in all kinds of education for all the people. That belief stirs some trouble of its own. Some do not stop to think whether or not the kind of education will go in a particular place, whether or not it will profit a particular people, whether or not it will make misfits, whether or not it may break the intellectual and industrial equilibrium of the country, and therefore impair the individual happiness and the moral and economic strength of the nation.

Now do not infer too quickly that the speaker may be lost in some sort of a wilderness; may have become blinded to the lights of a lifetime by some stupefying and profane influences. Every boy and girl, every man and woman, in America, is to have the utmost of educational opportunity that the country, having regard to the national unity and the rights of all, can provide. Every one is to be helped to the attainment of any distinct purpose which he may acquire. Every one is to be given aid in forming his purposes, and cheer on the road to their realization. We are in no danger of ever thinking that lowly birth may be an obstacle to intellectual greatness. We shall be nearer right in thinking that high birth is a greater obstacle. We shall never think that one kind of training is good for one class, and that the people in another class are not to be allowed to partake of it; or that there is another kind of education which is suited to one class, and that none in another class can ever want anything to do with it. The suggestion is so repugnant to the thinking of the country that it merits neither refutation nor consideration. The democracy, the very atmosphere, of America, dissolves social sets, redistributes professional and business inheritances, and intermingles the wealthier and the working classes, very quickly. The son of poor parents has about as good a chance as any other boy to be the rich man of tomorrow; the child of the wage-earner has as much prospect of intellectual conspicuity or commanding influence in the next generation as the child of the president of a university, or the president of the nation. Indeed, we carry our philosophy to such an extreme that it often puts an undue handicap upon the child of momentary prosperity. Fortunes in lands and securities, and in mental acquisition and in political preferment as well, are not much transmitted, or they are

so much divided in the transmission, or so dissipated by the inheritors, that they count but little. The exceptional legatee has burdens and troubles of his own.

Not much but work counts. It may be by the hand, it may be mental, it may be moral. It counts most if it embraces all. It must be adapted to qualities and environment. It must reckon with conditions and possibilities. It must be incessant, sustained, disciplined, progressive. The worker must regard other workers; the work must articulate with other work. There must be ideals, but they must be rational. It matters little what the work is, if it is of a kind that the world wants done, and if the one who undertakes it really does it. It matters much if it is of no account, or if the one who undertakes it has no habit of taking care, no interest in the process, no pride in the finished product. If it is well done, no matter what it is, the world will appreciate the work and regard the man who does it. And more than by inheritance, more than by situation, more than by favor or by chance, the qualities and the worth of the man are determined by the measure and the fineness of his work.

The efficiency of the worker, the fineness of the work, the consequent worth of the work to the country, and the reflex influence of the work upon the worker, turn very largely upon the free and natural, rather than upon the constrained, selection of work by the worker. To assure the results which are desirable he must choose for himself. Of course he must have incentives and inspirations; of course he must have lights and opportunities; but he must be left to his internal inclinations, tastes, and gifts, as well as to his external inspirations and opportunities, to choose the work which he wants to do, if there is to be much promise that he will do it well enough to be happy in the doing of it, and thus make it of some account to other people and therefore of more account to himself.

I make bold to raise the query whether the educational system of America has not had an overwhelming trend which has taken away much of the freedom of choice and naturalness of selection which are necessary to the best individual and public results from the adaptation of people to work. I suggest a question as to whether we do not have an abnormal, indeed an alarming, number of misfits between workers and work. It might not be amiss to go even further and raise a question as to whether there is not something in the common thought and common ambitions of the country,

and, as a consequence, something in the prevalent theories and plans of the schools, which actually leaves us with great quantities of work to do which goes undone, and also with great numbers of men and women who are not doing what they might do, and not doing much of anything anyway, when the very unfolding of their humanity depends upon the number of those who do tiring and productive work.

Perhaps the difficulty, if there is a difficulty, may be expressed more clearly, and possibly a remedy may be signified in this way: There are great, powerful, and productive nations where the overwhelming and successful policy is to keep the masses down. The laws are so made, the professions so guarded, the expression of political opinion so obstructed, the political assemblies so unrepresentative, and the social classes so incrustated and segregated, that the door of opportunity is practically or completely closed to a child of the people. The thing is definitely fixed and steadfastly maintained in a way which will enable the few, and their children for indefinite generations, to enjoy privileges that they never earned, through the political subordination and the physical labor of the multitude. In this country we hold all that in abhorrence. Our political fathers, no matter where our natural parents lived, determined that any law or usage which effected or continued that policy must go down, wherever the flag of the Union should signify the thought of the nation. We have not departed from the attitude of our fathers. We have worked out their philosophy in a largeness of fact and through a wilderness of difficulties of which they never had the slightest expectation or conception. We are now committed to that philosophy, not only because it was the philosophy of the fathers, but because it has gained strength through the difficulties it has experienced, and shown its beneficence through its practical applications. We have undoubting confidence that we have the brains and whatever physical strength may be necessary to work it out completely, no matter how wide the territory over which the flag floats and no matter how many or how diverse the people who live beneath its beautiful folds. And we surrender no title of all this when we raise the question whether, in the severity of our determination to avoid the subordination of the many to the few, as in other lands, we have not gone too far towards the other extreme and advanced conceptions which, acting upon the susceptible and ambitious temperament of the people of the United States, have led too many to think that they can succeed by wits without

work, and can manage the business of other people before there is evidence that they are able to manage their own.

In our rhetoric and declamation every American is a king. This is idealistic, but very often it is misunderstood. For any practical end it lacks the necessary discrimination between kings and between people. On the whole, it must be admitted that the kings have been rather a poor lot, and on the whole it must be said, if we say anything about it, that we have plenty of people who are kingly in that sense alone. In the theory, the intent, and the outworking of our pure democracy, every man stands equal with every other man in the making and the protection of the law. But that is far from all. The rest depends upon himself. As to the rest, he is unequal with other men. And the rest is largely in liquid state until it is given form and consistency in the schools.

The schools have many fallacies. The boys are pointed to the millionaires, to the inventors and discoverers, to presidents of banks and railroads, to military and naval heroes, and to the presidency of the nation. One who lacks ambition for these places is deemed to be hardly worth the counting. Ambition, training in the culturing studies, wits, and luck, are thought to be the stairs to eminence and glory. Yet the men who have reached altitudes by such means are rare in the extreme, and with rare exceptions they have been unsubstantial and unreliable when they got there. The men who have attained eminence and held it securely have been hard, severe, long-continued, uncomplaining, and unrelenting workers. The signboards at the crossroads, in the courses of the schools have pointed the boys to professional occupations. The road to these seems easy to a boy, and it is a rare boy that will not choose the easier thing. Yet, as a good friend, a natural lawyer, an honored judge, and a senator of the United States, wrote in my autograph album when I was a law student, "The successful lawyer, above almost all other men, must earn his bread in the sweat of his brow." The physician who is not a systematic, joyous, seasoned laborer, is a dangerous character to have about your house. It is so with clergymen and engineers and bankers and merchants, and all the rest who make any real impression upon life.

The schools not only overlook or undervalue the processes which are essential to any success worth talking about in commercial, professional, and political life, but they are exceedingly indiscriminating about the situations in life which are of most account to the

particular liver, as well as about the studies and processes and the hard labor by which they are to be reached. The man who has a craft and comes somewhere near being the master of it, is to be envied in comparison with the man who has got into a bank or a printing office and can not get to the fore in it. And the man who has developed a farm, with all its interesting and inspiring attributes, is a veritable king when compared with those who have taken rooms in the basements of the professions. Neither the successful craftsman nor the efficient farmer has to ask special favors. Both grow balanced and hardy through the demands and the limitations of their work, and both are doing work which the world has to have. Both are as independent as need be, and independence makes for influence and respect in the common life.

But the control and direction of children have been much relaxed, and we have had a pretty hard attack of something which has struck at educational values, rejected known roads, indulged in novel speculations which can be neither demonstrated nor disproved, points to everything and gets nowhere.

The trouble with the schools, certainly the lower schools (and there is trouble with the lower schools, at least) is that they lack definite aims, unless they are aims which ought not to appeal to more than a moiety of the people. They do not train into the child the habit of taking extreme care, and they do not demand clearness of process and completeness of result. They do not sufficiently recognize the imperative demands of labor and exactness as the essential basis of a national system of education. So much must come first, in any event, and after that there may be free choice, when the child is old enough to make a choice. There is not only the lack of the essential foundation, but also of the opportunity for the subsequent free choice. The overwhelming influences of the schools are all in the direction of a superficial culture, although sustained and successful work is the instrument of all true culture; and of professional and managing vocations, although the places are overfull. Children have to leave the schools to escape their trend. If they do not leave for that purpose, they certainly do leave because it is not made worth while for them to stay. Only one third of the children in the elementary schools continue to the end. Only a part of these go to the high schools; only one third of those who go to the high schools remain beyond the second year; and only one sixth to one tenth of those who go continue to their

graduation. All the rest drop out along the way, either because the majority of our people have a low estimate of the advantages of education, or because they think that it is more to their advantage to have their children leave school than to remain.

It is not saying that a child should not have his free choice in determining what he shall do, nor is it implying that he shall not be helped to any opportunity for which he wants to try, to say that there is exclusiveness and repression in such a situation, and that in the outworking of our democracy in our education the forcing of children to such an alternative as that must disappear.

Freedom of choice does not imply that all our children shall have a literary or professional training; it does not demand that in all parts of the country there must be the same kind or the same grade of schools; it does not demand that in its name children shall be guided into vocations that are overstocked, or for which they are not adapted; it does not demand, most certainly, that children shall be led into vocations that misfit them, or given the alternative of going, without training, into a vocation which they might want, and which it would be profitable to the country for them to have. The demand of our democracy is for equality of opportunity. We have gone too far or we have not gone far enough. We can not avoid the question. We can not escape the attitude of the Constitution; but perhaps we may understand it more perfectly. The demand of the economic situation and of common justice, that there shall be schools suited to the needs of all people and leading to all manner of vocations, will have to be heeded.

The fact is that we men and women of the schools keep close track of one another. The news of the schools is all printed and we read it. We travel a great deal. We each undertake to keep up with all the rest. The discussions have all been of the same general character, and the projections have all been in one general direction. We have each added whatever subjects of a culturing curriculum the people would stand, and brought in all the incidental novelties, the conventions could suggest. The school boards have been almost paralyzed. Obstacles to education are not allowed in this country; but may not some obstacles to some education in some places be healthful? There has been skepticism, but no man of the world has felt just confidence enough in his skepticism to say bluntly, "Pull that building around square with the world before we go any further about it."

Schools to Suit Conditions

We are eternally conforming and standardizing. What we need is not schools that are alike, but principles that are fundamental and schools as diverse as the conditions are. Of course, all schools must have standards, but they must be standards of sense, standards of character, standards of information, and not standards of uniform courses, or uniform methods, for all the schools of a state or of the country. The universal comparisons between state systems and between city systems, and the universal effort to have as good as any other state or city has, lead to results which are as remote as can be imagined from the needs of the greater part of the constituencies of the schools. What is needed is to bring the teacher and the parents and the children near enough together to make it possible for them to understand the needs and make the most of the possibilities of one another.

For years the tendency of one enthusiast after another in the community has put more and more upon the schools. There are societies to effect everything that ever developed in a dream, and an average school superintendent or an ordinary school board is a weak defense to the onset of a society of enthusiasts, particularly of women enthusiasts. Politeness and platitudes have to suffice, when policemen and fortifications are necessary. Newspapers agitate, just as a matter of "newspaper policy," which means a policy that will sell more papers. A mere sentiment comes to be a "cause" of the people, and what confuses and takes from the concentration and efficiency of the schools gains a place in their curriculums.

Authorship and the publishing business play a part in the multiplicity of studies, and a worse part in prolonging and attenuating studies beyond their right. The school life of the child is within limits of age. It is none too long. It is precious time. Whatever takes more than its right, subtracts just so much from something else that is vital to the rounding out of the child's life to its utmost. Whatever does not give him added power to do makes for insipidity and saps his strength. Say all we will, and say it truly, about a child needing a complex education to fit him for life in a complex civilization, the fact remains that the things which make for complexity should not be permitted to begin so early as to endanger his imperative need of oral and written language and of the simple processes of mathematics.

We are a considerate and tolerant people. For a score of years good people whose minds seem to live in an inflated atmosphere have pretty nearly monopolized the attention in the schools where teachers are trained. In the colleges and universities — their proper field, if they have a proper field — their doctrines and propositions are rather sharply resisted by other departments, and the zone of their research and confusion is healthfully circumscribed. But "researching" in the normal and training schools has few limitations, and the consequent uncertainty attains a density that brings average minds to prostration. The effect upon the young girl teachers is pathetic. They are not only called upon to do more things than they can do in order to meet the demands of enthusiasts, but they are invoking the aid of occult sciences, and feel obliged to accomplish ends by constrained methods and devices which are destructive of that freedom which is the essence of effectiveness in teaching. Useless illustration and exploitations consume time, if they do not obscure the point and defeat the end. Out of it all the children do not have trained into them the ability to do some particular thing. The parents are confounded. The school boards have become nearly helpless. The general public is restless and anxious.

It is imperative that there be a closer adaptation of schools to situations, and that schools have more and longer control over children, and move forward to definite ends. There is much being said now, and it is necessarily said, about the development of technical and trades schools in the towns. But that is but one manifestation of a wider difficulty.

The schools must meet the needs of a particular people, whether these needs are high or low, academic, professional, commercial, agricultural, or manufacturing. We can not expect the people to adjust themselves wholly to schools. We must adjust the schools in very considerable measure to people. For some reasons it is better to describe a farm by saying that it is in the northern half of the 20th section in township no. 9 in the north range no. 3, west of the 6th prime meridian, as they do in Nebraska, than it is to say that 63 acres, more or less, are in the town of Long Lake, in the county of Aroostook, and bounded by stone fences or lanes, monumented by a blazed tree, a deer's antlers, a fox's hole, or a red heifer, as they may do in the Maine woods. But one system will have to prevail until a better one comes in, and there are more important things than prime meridians in locating boundary lines,

when the lands go down in the family, and you don't have to give, and nobody wants to take, a mortgage upon them. It is well if people have got far enough to need and to support high schools and colleges, but if they have not, there is even greater necessity that they shall have elementary schools suited to their exact needs, and whether they have or not, their elementary schools must be adjusted to their conditions and look forward to their work, or the bottom will fall out of the high schools, or there will come an educational cleavage which is repugnant to that theory of government which has been the backbone of our prosperity and is the hope of our future.

We hear a great deal about consolidating schools and carrying children long distances to central schools, in order to have graded schools and finer buildings. It is well where the people with such lights as they have, or will have, want it so, but there is no pedagogical reason why it should be *forced upon them*. There are difficulties about children being carried several miles to school, and there are pretty strong reasons why it is well to have a school within walking distance of every home. Graded schools have troubles of their own. A school does not have to be a big school in order to be a very good one. The teacher who has to reckon with the life of the family and the outlook of the child, may be, and often is, doing much better teaching than the teacher who is bent upon conforming her processes to the creed of a training school or the philosophy of the books, without such an understanding of doctrines as will enable her to know that dogma is not of much account where it fails to meet situations. The percentage of strong and balanced characters who come out of the country schools, where the teaching is personal and direct, is greater than that of similar characters growing out of schools where classification is imperative and the teaching necessarily much less personal and direct. Modern conveniences are lessening the difficulties of the country schools. There is no overwhelming advantage in huddling people or pupils together more than they do it themselves under the necessities of the case. And it is a great pity that there is so much educational confidence or courtesy as to keep some doctrines about conformity in education from meeting with something like the frigid reception which bulls about conformity in religion would encounter in the General Assembly of my church. Sweeping generalizations are as inapplicable in one field as in the other.

This principle holds as good in the upper schools as in the lower ones. Some are "standardizing" American universities just now. You can not standardize American universities any more than you can standardize the color of American apples, or the height of American women. There are apples that command the top of the market even though they are not red, and there are women who are *mighty*, even though they do not approach the altitude of the Broadway squad of the Metropolitan police. So there are colleges and universities which are first-class, even though they have less than a thousand students and do not attempt many things that the larger ones make much of; and there are others which are second-class or third-class with two thousand or three thousand students, who are offered everything that can be named in an educational bill of fare.

Classifying and standardizing are difficult and often dangerous processes in this country. They are impossible in American education. If it is a mere matter of association or congeniality none will object, for that is a harmless matter of feeling and of tastes. If it is a means of educational helpfulness, it well might use better descriptive words. If it is a process of discrimination, of exclusiveness, of depreciation, then it must end where all meanness in education eventually does. There is no conclusive argument against the big college or the little college, the rich college or the poor college, the classical college or the industrial college. It is a question of fitness and efficiency, of adaptation and of accomplishment. No matter what other attributes it may have or may lack, that college is of the first rank in America which sends its flag furthest into the ranks of ignorance and meanness by turning out the largest percentage of true and productive men and women.

A few years ago Harvard University put the entrance requirements at the schools of law and medicine upon the basis of an approved baccalaureate degree. That was well. The schools suffered somewhat in attendance, but advanced scholarship gained by it. Then other universities discussed it, some attempted it, and a small number accomplished it. It was all well enough. But there was an assumption in the discussion that a move which might be a good one at one institution must therefore be good at another. That is not necessarily true. By far the greater number of professional schools could not exist upon that basis, and it is desirable that such of them as are honest and doing the best they can shall exist. All intending professional students can not follow a prescribed course

of scientific training until they are twenty-six or twenty-eight years old before they are allowed to begin practising a profession, and all people can not afford to pay the fees which professional men so trained feel entitled to exact. You may tell me that I am standing for the lower rather than the higher ideals in scholarship. No, I am standing for the rational, the serviceable, and the fruitful ideals in scholarship. I am standing for schools that can serve the country. I am glad that some institutions are reaching the highest altitudes, glad that the time has come when students no longer need go to foreign universities for the very best instruction. But every school is to have its chance, and every student is to have his chance. You may well believe that the time will never come when all or nearly all of the great men in any profession will be enrolled in the alumni of a single professional school, no matter what its admission requirements may have been. A full proportion of the great men will always come from small or weak schools in which there is some ordinary teacher who fires their lives. Schools are to meet situations that exist, and uplift constituencies of their own. They can not do that by merely copying or conforming.

Lack of Aim and Efficiency

The advanced schools, or their departments, have become so much differentiated that each has a very definite aim. By the time students are old enough to enter them they have gained rather clear purposes, and they select the school and the department which can do for them just what they want to have done. That is so in some measure, though much less so, with the middle schools. They are too often afflicted with more of a desire to undertake the natural work of the colleges and the professional schools, which they can not do well because they can not have the instructors, the equipment or the basis of preparation for it, than they are endowed with a proud ambition to do the legitimate work of schools of their grade, so that when pupils have finished it is known that they are in possession of the information and the power to do some definite thing which can be given a valuation in the world of education and in the world of fact and of affairs. Still, the pupils who remain after the second year in the high school do begin the process of satisfying ambitions which have begun to take definite form; and if they are clear enough of vision and strong enough of purpose, they often find the helps of which their particular ambitions stand in need.

There is practically nothing of this in the elementary schools. That is a most serious and menacing fact in American education. If it is said that there can not be, because of the immaturity of the pupils, it is answered that there is no such difficulty in other great national systems of education, and that the pupils are quite as immature there as here. The only aim in our lower schools is the grade above, and the one above that, and the road leads either to intellectual culture without any definite vocational aims, or to employments that are professional or at least semiprofessional in character. As a result the multitudes tire of it. The minority follow it, and, notwithstanding the steadily increasing exactions, more gain access to the professional and managing vocations than is good for them, good for such vocations, or good for the country. But the majority quit the road all along the line because they can not see that it is going to lead to any definite acquisition that will make it to their advantage to remain.

It is a very common impression among the poor, and among some who are not so poor, that there is really more advantage to the child in going to work than in continuing in school. And if there really were work for them, and if they were actually being trained into it, how many of us could justly say that the conclusion is devoid of reason? But the grave fact is that the sixty per cent of the children who drop out of the elementary schools without finishing them are not prepared for any definite work, no matter how simple, and the work they do find does not lead to self-improvement, because it is of a kind which grinds the heart and bone out of them for the enlargement of dividends.

There are other facts associated with this one which must be mentioned but need not be argued. Any great work having relation to both sexes imperatively claims the cooperative effort of both men and women. The number of women teachers, the consequent low basis of wages, the agitation about equal pay for similar work in spite of all economic and educational considerations, and particularly the pernicious manipulation of party politics by organizations of women teachers in the larger cities, is preventing, speaking generally, the stronger men from engaging in teaching, and is forcing out some who have already commenced. For obvious reasons it is a menace to that balance in the work of the schools which is imperative to the interests of both boys and girls who are to form ambitions and find employments in a balanced world.

The doings of the primary schools in the great cities have undue influence upon the operations of the primary schools in the entire country, and this is particularly illustrated in the growing disposition to make a teacher's position a comfortable subsistence for life, protected by law, rather than an imperative and responsible instrument of common needs and of the best public opinion. Of course it has grown out of the very largeness of the system, and of the unjust and reprehensible treatment which has sometimes been inflicted upon teachers by weak, or worse than weak, superintendents and boards of education. It all illustrates the difficulties which justice and effectiveness have to encounter at the hands of democratic government, and it particularly exemplifies the importance of thrusting all partizanship out of the management of the schools.

These things contribute to a situation which wastes the lives of pupils. With the unnecessary studies, the undue prolongation of studies through a series of books in a single study, and the undue emphasis upon mere methods and exploitation; with the fact that the pupils are not reaching forward to some definite thing in which they are interested; with the further fact that the home is no longer of much help because the character of the home has changed and because the work and processes of the schools are so changed that parents are unable to comprehend them, there is little wonder that the work is often behind the age of the pupil, as it is. Then there is the further fact that there is a very common national indifference if not repugnance to enforced attendance upon the schools. So there is no lack of explanation of the wastage in the work of our elementary schools, and of a percentage of illiteracy in the United States which exceeds that of any other favored nation in the world.

"All Men are Created Equal"

What is the matter and what is to be done? Our democracy has often been misinterpreted and misunderstood. It is not strange that it has been misinterpreted, because there is no other democracy like it. Something very important happened in this country on the 4th day of July 1776, and because of that, some things even more important have happened since. Our independence enlarged the freedom of a people who inherited and never gave up their full share of the liberty of the nation which had gone further in making laws, and in defining human rights under human laws, than

any other nation in the world. Independence of itself gave us some rather inflated ideas about freedom, and those ideas have been still more inflated by the rather loose thinking of the millions who have come to us with the notion that freedom was offered and exemplified by the absence of the army or of the police, more than by the free play of moral sense, the equal rights of all, not some, of the people, and the binding obligations and limitations of moral as well as civic law. The trouble has been that in the prevalent thought freedom has been regarded without much concern for the foundations upon which it must rest, and the limitations within which it must operate, and the processes by which it must be enlarged, if it is to be secure or is to be enlarged at all.

For a familiar but excellent illustration of this, see the difficulty we have in getting children in and keeping them in the schools. The attendance upon school is more irregular in the United States than in any other nation with whom we would be willing to be compared. It is not merely because there are people here who are indifferent to schools. There are such in all nations. It is not because we have more of these than other nations have. It is because the measure of control is less here than there, and because of the common misunderstanding in this country of what freedom truly is, and of how it is to be retained or enlarged. In a word, it is because public sentiment is not quick about seeing the need, nor keen about sustaining the processes for enforcing attendance upon the schools. We hold out more freedom of choice than do other peoples. Our schools attempt more than theirs. They do what they undertake more completely than we do. The habit of sending all children to school is much better established with them than with us. It has been established by law and by force. Our fallacious reasoning about freedom forces upon us a percentage of illiteracy several times larger than that of any other well organized and well governed country in the world.

What is to be done? Laws and educational systems — and educational systems are one expression of laws — have to be recast frequently in order to correspond with the growth and progress of peoples. It is not necessary to conclude that our national and political fundamentals are wrong, as some seem disposed to do. It is only necessary to give those fundamentals a rational interpretation and erect a more perfect superstructure upon them.

One says, "Everybody who is well informed now sees that the declaration that 'all men are created equal' is only a glittering

platitude." This is not true. That phrase was neither a perversity nor a pleasantry. Far from its being mere rhetoric or bombast, it is, in my conception of the great soul of the nation, a tremendous basic fact, and I am proud of being one of the people who have confidently entered upon and successfully moved along the rugged road to its most complete realization in human history. I do not believe that the men in the Continental Congress were either capable of mere bumptiousness or incapable of expressing what they intended in very good English phrase. Of course, their manner of expression was of their day and generation. Within that limitation they succeeded very well in expressing the things to which they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Has any one ever supposed that, when they declared as a political truism that all men are created equal, they intended to say that men are equal in height or in width or in weight? Has any one supposed that they intended to say that all men are equal in the tenseness of their feelings, or in the direction and the strength of their thinking? Or has any one imagined that they intended to be understood as thinking that all men are equal in their possessions, their attributes, or their opportunities? Washington's armies fought for no such idle contention, for no such absurd ideal, as this. It was a lawyer's phrase. It was the phrase of good lawyers and it was a good phrase. The lives and training of the men who framed it, the only logical hypothesis upon which it can be made consistent with all the other things they said, and the only interpretation which makes the Declaration worth the struggle of the Revolution — all combine to make it clear that the laws of this country were to guarantee all men and women an entire equality of legal protection and *legal* right, that the common power should not be used to keep one down nor to lift another up, and that the laws of the land should articulate with God's justice in holding out to every one the legal right to the equal chance to make the most of himself.

All that we have to do in order to enable our schools to promote our national ideals is to go back to the fundamentals of our political faith, square our theories with their obvious intent, and create instrumentalities which enable rational ideals to run their natural course, as the waters of the uplands follow their even channels to the sea.

Every American child is to have his chance. It is not to be thwarted by any law of the government or any usage of the people.

It is not to be long hindered by the lack of educational instrumentalities which may aid it. Of course, the large factor is in the personal qualities which are looking for a chance, which can recognize a chance when they see it, and which have wits, and force, and endurance, and patience enough to make the most of it. But these are not the only factors. A child's destiny is not settled in this country by the circumstances of birth. It is a great thing to live in a land where experience proves that riches quite as much as poverty, the city quite as much as the country, and conceit quite as much as necessity, are barriers on the roads to the elevations. But even this is not all. A child's future is not to be clouded or obstructed by any assignments which a teacher may make, by any false valuations of the prizes of life, by any fallacious theories about the kind of success which is of the most worth, by any wasting of his time in order to accommodate the rigidity of an organization, or try out the vagaries of pedagogical speculation, or by any forced misfits which must logically follow official, legislative, or professional misconceptions of the relations of our democracy to the free opportunities of men and women. It is time to stop practising upon children in the schools; it is time to stop implying that work with the head is better than work with the hands; it is time to stop forcing them into grooves which satisfy notions that are too common, but in most cases lead to a loss of every kind of efficiency and to ends which are alike humiliating to the individuals most concerned and opposed to the general welfare of the nation. It is time to put the emphasis upon work, no matter what it is about; it is time to inspire expertness, no matter what in; it is time to help qualities adapt themselves to productivity, no matter in what direction. Charity is not to be confused with the work of the schools. The right to an education is inherent. With that right the child must sink or swim, and more will swim if there is no confusion about it. But the schools must reach every child, no matter whether his parents will it or not. We must have more definite aims, and we must assure more concrete results. We may expect the complexity of the educational system to meet the complexities of our modern civilization, but in some way each school must have a simpler life which will help, and not confound, all who are concerned in it. Every American child must have an open, free, clear, legal, American chance. So far as he is constrained or guided, it must be only in aid of his own freedom and in the direction of his own best possibilities.

Uniformity in Principles

To help every one gain his best chance, we must know what we are after. We must have a better understanding of the principles which we are trying to make good.

Every child, every one in the land, must be recorded, to the end that his rights may be assured.

Every one must have an elementary education, and, before everything else, an elementary education must mean the power to read and write and master the simple processes of mathematics.

The school must have equal respect for every manner of work. It must know that without application and endurance there is no hope, and that with them there will be some result of just as much moment as any other result which it might have gained.

The work of the school must have definite aim, and its ends must be assured. There is too much scattering. Before a child is permitted to leave the school it must be known that he has a definite possession which never can be taken from him. The schools must carry him as far as under the conditions of his life they can be of help to him.

The schools must train for every vocation for which there is any reasonable demand, and the child must be under the control of the school until there is ground for confidence that he has some need of finding his chance, some desire and application, some fitness for employment which will enable him to begin to earn a living.

The child must be allowed his free election of vocation after he has acquired the simpler work of the elementary schools. But he must know that he is not to drop out and not to be allowed to waste his time, at least until he reaches an age or a situation where the case is apparently helpless and hopeless.

The work of each school, being simpler and more definite, must be more intensive. Unnecessary time is consumed. It is worse to waste the time of a child than to take away any other right that he may have. He must get the larger part of his culture through his work. It will be a finer and truer culture than can be gained in any other way. What culture comes through mere instruction is well, but it is secondary and must wait upon the essentials. The same with mere information: if he has the elements which give him the power to get it, he will get it when he needs it or when he wants it. If he does not, the public can not help it.

All of the children of the United States are entitled to be taken out of the list of the illiterates and to be taught to do some definite

thing, and to be made to know that their success depends upon their doing it better than others do. Then the unexpected and the surprising successes will doubtless be multiplied, and, whether they are or not, the nation will be the stronger.

Diversity in Means and Methods

With some reasonable agreement about the measure of opportunity which the educational activities of the nation are bound to hold out to every American child, and with our abundant knowledge of what is going on in every part of the country, there will be all of the uniformity that is desirable, if we encourage the freest diversity and individuality in means and methods. It is not necessary that the schoolhouses be of the same height and color. They need not all have heating plants that balk when called upon for special effort, and forbid an open window at all times. The schools do not all have to have identical courses of study, and there is no reason why they should use the same books. The teachers do not have to have the same convolutions in their brains that have formed in the brains of those physiological psychologists who fall down in their physiology and get beside themselves over their psychology. It is of less moment what one knows when he enters a school than what he knows when he leaves it. It is enough if he has the power and the will to do the work. With some reasonable promise of that, he is to have his chance. The most unpromising freshman often develops into the particular star of the commencement morning. There are to be standards, but they are to be the standards of individual institutions. The degrees of all the colleges ought not to be expected to represent the same thing. We are to prevent fakes and frauds. It is well for a state to protect academic terms from such abuse by fixing the attributes which an institution must have before it can hold itself out to be a high school, an academy, a college, or a university. But, being within the legal requirements, and being honest, it must find its own level and abide its own doings. The pupil, the student, and the teacher, are to use the means they have or can get, in their own way, to their own advantage, and to the common good.

The glory of the American school system is in the fact that it is not to be fixed, and shaped, and determined, and limited by a minister, but by a representative government answerable to a pure democracy. It is in its flexibility, its adaptability to all conditions. This leads some to confuse the process of determination with the

process of carrying out what has been determined upon; or, in other words, to confuse legislative with executive functions. We are to develop policies which hold out to every one his chance, by the use of the best means we have, and having established the policies and appropriated the means, we are to exercise whatever of the common power may be needed to accomplish the designated ends. But we are never to forget that the worst results are likely to flow from adopting methods which can not be adapted, and from setting up instrumentalities which do not fit situations. The sanguine temperament, the prevailing ambition of the people, may be relied upon to do its part; but if temperament and ambition be unwisely played upon, there is danger of unfortunate result. The information we have of world education, the intellectual and physical work we have to do, the logical adaptation of people to work, the free chance for all, the obligation to reduce illiteracy to an absolute minimum and see that no child is robbed of his right, and the natural rather than forced flow of our national life, will combine to produce an educational system which is much broader at the base than at the top; which makes the most of the child and accomplishes some definite thing for him; which makes him know that he must work, aids his choice and fits him for his best vocation, and carries him as far as he wants to go in acquiring a balanced conception of life, as well as in mastering what is in the books.

Conclusion

I recall a good story which President Roosevelt tells upon himself, in one of his hunting tales, of an exasperating experience with blacktail deer. At the sunset of a weary day a fine buck appeared at an opening in the woods at the sky-line of a mountain, and within fair rifle shot. The President fired both barrels, and says he heard his guide heave a sigh as the deer threw up his head and trotted off unhurt. Directly another appeared at the same opening, and he grasped another rifle and gave him the possibilities of two more shots. The guide sighed clear to his toes as the deer bounded away unhurt. In disgust which words could not express the two mounted their horses and started for the cabin. After going a mile, the guide gathered his courage to offer consolation. "Never mind! I s'pose ye done the best ye could." "No, I'll be blanked if I did," was the answer. The expletive was justified. It was not the best that he could do. He has made few so bad, and many better, shots since. If we admit that we have made many miss-shots, let us believe that they have not been the best that we can do.

FROM MANUAL TRAINING TO TECHNICAL AND TRADES SCHOOLS

REPRINTED FROM THE EDUCATIONAL REVIEW OF APRIL 1908, BY COURTESY OF THE EDUCATIONAL REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY

It can not be doubted, and ought not to be disguised, that the early and general belief (before the days of public high schools and so many colleges) that the elementary school system was amply adequate to the needs of the country has been much shaken in the last quarter century. It is not because of the lessening of either highly trained or popular interest in education; indeed, it is because all manner and grades of education have become more and more a passion with all classes of our people. It is not because of any waning confidence in our educational theories, or in the basic principles of our public schools. The "equal chance for all" becomes more and more valued and jealously guarded as our fundamental political theory works its way out in our governmental practices. The American people have become so accustomed to making and managing schools that they have but indifferent interest about those in which they do not have some sense of proprietorship. But common sentiment, uncertain for a long time, has reached a very confident belief that new situations have arisen which the elementary schools do not reach, and that something rather decisive must be done to adapt their work to the possible expectations of children who are not going to the high schools. It is seen that they must have more definite aims, and must make sure of more exact industrial conclusions, if they are to meet the imperative needs of the children of the wage-earners, as well as the economic, intellectual, and moral necessities of the country.

This development ought not to surprise us. It has come upon schedule time. It is in the natural order and it is healthful. Schools supported and managed by the public can hardly be expected to anticipate conditions or to outrun popular needs. Neither the foresight nor the warnings of the schoolmasters make much impression. In their essentials the schools respond to public opinion. Before they create new social states they are the instruments of older social situations. New understandings stir and solidify sentiment, and then the school boards and the schoolmasters make the plans for giving effect to it.

The situation results from the fact that every American is entitled to his chance, and because of American temperaments and ambitions. We tell the children in the schools that they are of small account if they neglect their chance. They hear less about increasing their efficiency in ordinary undertakings than they do about going higher up. The "higher up" refers to lawyers, and surgeons, and engineers, and masters of great works, and admirals in the navy, and the presidency itself. The schools which are thought to lead to these positions are literary and classical; if they are scientific, their interest is only in the sciences which are vital to the professions. Our high schools are therefore literary and scientific in this sense. It is true that they have done a little something in manual training, but they have taken good care not to do enough of it, or not to do the kind of it, *which would create the danger of their pupils learning a trade*. About all of our educational activities have led *away* from craftsmanship. We have gone on training for the professional and managing vocations until the educational system is unbalanced. If we were to train for vocations at all, we were bound to give all vocations an equal chance. Either we have not seen the greatest need or we have not dared to do the thing most needed because it was not in line with the usual inspirations and ambitions. We have made ourselves believe what, when generally applied, was fallacious and simply impossible. We have misled children and that has made misfits.

For perhaps three decades we have had a vague notion that there was something wrong about our educational system because so many children were going away from the manual industries. To meet the difficulty, we have, in an awkward kind of way, and without any very consistent theory or any very definite plan about it, added manual training annexes to our high schools. We have listened to the manual training leaders with some condescension because we have realized that something in the direction of what they were talking about was desirable, but we have listened to them with so little confidence that (in order to float at all) they have had to spend most of their time looking out for snags. The people who do things only or mainly with their heads have looked upon the manual training exhibits with a kind of admiration which was not psychologically any too clear, and the real mechanics have viewed them with feelings in which skepticism and amusement were mixed.

We have placed the little work in our schools which has any application to manual dexterity so high up in the system that the

children who are to work with their hands never see it, and we have distinctly said that our manual training schools were not intended to train for any particular vocation. We have even said that they were to be nothing but culturing institutions which would develop all the attributes of the human being harmoniously, and, very particularly, that they were to quicken the intellect by increasing the dexterity of the hand. In practice we have kept faith with this theory, for the public educational system of the country has taught no trades, and, without intending any slight, it must be added that its industrial schools have been arranged and taught by men who were essentially theorists and not specially skilful as craftsmen themselves. The result has been that our industrial training until now has had practically no relation to our common hand industries.

Of course the public school system has exerted some very desirable influences and accomplished some very good things. It has done something towards preparing pupils for the higher technical schools and the mechanical colleges. It has recently begun to establish advanced technical schools in the larger cities which have many factories where the work is done mainly by machinery. Nothing can be more desirable than keeping the operator ahead of the machine. That has not gone beyond a half dozen cities, however, except in discussion, and in a discussion which deems it prudent to avoid issues with the labor unions by asserting its good purposes not to teach trades. While much has been done in the public educational system towards training for professional vocations and positions of leadership, practically nothing has been done in the way of training hand workmen. The net result has, on the whole, *actually discredited real craftsmanship.*

The public school system has shunted this thing off so persistently and completely that private philanthropic and proprietary schools and a few of the great manufacturing establishments have taken it up, either as a charity, or for gain, or from necessity. But private schools have made, and are likely to make, but a slight impression upon the large problem, for the American people are too much accustomed to proprietorship in education to give much adhesion to schools in which they have no fixed rights.

While this situation has been developing, the old way of training boys for work through apprenticeship has practically disappeared. Employers do not want to be bothered with apprentices, and workmen not only have some of the same feeling but are apprehensive

about more workmen lowering wages. On both sides the motive relates, in much greater measure than it should, to the present hour and to immediate profits or wages. Even the number of apprentices approved by the rules of the labor organizations is not being trained in the factories or the trades.

Meanwhile the manner of family living has greatly changed, and girls in vast numbers, who are no longer trained in the household arts, are becoming generally inefficient, or are seeking public employments at low wages, and excluding boys therefrom.

With all these things, and some other things, the primary schools are in trouble. They are better supported and better organized than ever before. They are taught by teachers who are uniformly better trained for their work than ever before. But specialists and enthusiasts have overloaded them with work and theories that consume time unprofitably, and they undoubtedly come short of meeting some of the most urgent needs of a new situation. It is not that all of the difficulty is outside of the schools. Some of it is inside. They are to be judged frankly but truly. And, anyway, the real question is, what is the matter and how can it be mended?

It has been widely assumed that the children in the elementary schools remain to finish them; but not more than one third of them do so. At least, that is so in the cities, and in the country there is neither beginning nor end. Half of the children in the primary schools of the cities do not go beyond the fifth of the eight grades.

The law compels attendance only till the age of fourteen, and parents often reason that obedience to the mere letter of the law is all that is necessary. Not a few parents fall short of that; and the people in general give very little support to the officers who try to enforce the attendance laws.

We not only need to modify our ideals about the work that is of the most worth to the country and its people, but quite as much we need to take a reef or two in the sails which we are presenting to the breezes of freedom. In any event, some authority will have to assume control over children, and we shall have to come squarely to the point of requiring children to be in school when they ought to be there. No nation has ever prospered which did not do that, and we are not likely to be an exception to the universal rule.

Then, the primary schools have no definite aim unless it be to send children to the high schools, and thus to some professional or managing vocation, and wage-earning fathers are not much interested in that. They reason, doubtless, that their children will

not be better prepared by staying in school to earn a living in the way they must earn it, and that they might as well try to have them pick up some earnings at once.

Again, it must be admitted, I think, that the schools are behind the ages of the children. A boy at fourteen becomes restless under the direction of a woman teacher, and tires of the work which is set for him in the fifth grade. If the studies in the elementary schools are not too many, they are certainly too much drawn out. There are too many books in one branch and there is too much rather fanciful exploitation. The educational conventions give too much time to novelties. There are so many conventions that the discussions run afield. The schools illustrate and experiment too much. They are indifferent about the time of pupils, and they do not fit children for any definite work unless it is professional or semiprofessional. So, two thirds of the children do not remain to finish the primary schools, and, even though they remain to the end, there is much complaint that they are not prepared to do any definite thing unless it be to go to the high school.

The high schools and academies, the colleges and universities, the advanced technical schools, and the professional schools, which are either public or exact only low fees and offer many scholarships, are more than adequate to the training of all the "professionals" or "intellectuals" that the country can use. Indeed, they are so overstocking the professions with misfits, and turning youth from craftsmanship, that if the thing goes on indefinitely the country must be the poorer by it.

But there is a rather virile democracy in this country. It has not yet gone so far in education and industries as in politics and religion. It is getting under way, however. It wants all that belongs to it and intends to have it. It is being waked up by the trades schools and all of the industrialism of Europe, and particularly of Germany. It sees that in twenty-five years the German exports of home manufactures have grown more rapidly than the American, notwithstanding the great expansion of our occupied territory, the great enlargement of our towns, and the splendid intellectual advance of our population, and it does not fail to see that labor and skill are larger factors than materials in making it so. It is beginning to discern the fact that the universality of labor and the development of skill are great factors in generating moral and intellectual power in men and women, and in adding to the strength of nations, as well as in operating factories and in enlarging profits.

Our democracy is beginning to complain that the school system discriminates in behalf of the well-to-do and in favor of the intellectual employments. It really sees that there is less actual democracy in education in America than in some countries which have kings; that in some inscrutable way we have done more for the top of our educational system, which has few votes but is best able to care for itself, than for the bottom, with more votes and less power; and it reasons, erroneously no doubt, that the part which was best able to care for itself has done it with some selfishness. If it was through selfishness, it was as misguided as selfishness usually is. But our democracy takes little account of reasons, or of processes, or of mistakes. It sees a situation and is bent upon changing it.

Happily these thoughts are not monopolized by any class of people; nor is this democracy exercised by any exclusive set of people. The interests and opinions of all classes are at last coming into accord. It is seen that there must be a new, a far more diversified, and a much more universal industrialism; and it is also seen that there is no escape from the fact that the public schools must be made to take the burden of it.

The newspapers and conventions are declaring for "industrial training," the schools and charitable institutions are trying to meet the demand, states are legislating for it, and a national organization has been established to promote it.

The only hesitating interests are the corporations and the labor organizations. They have to think about where they will come out in such matters as profits, and bread and butter; and, with reason enough, based upon experience, they are skeptical about the schools being able to train real mechanics and turn out real workmen. The hesitating interests may be expected to be willing to experiment, however, under the pressure of popular opinion and in the presence of a great national movement. Certainly so in view of the fact that we have reached the point where there is no longer any efficient agency outside of the schools for training workmen; and where it is clear enough that the schools, with some reconstruction, may do it much more satisfactorily than any other instrumentality that can be provided.

What shall be done? First of all we must have a plan. It must be definite. It must have all of the support that can be brought to it. To that end it must be fundamentally sound. It must be based upon our democratic philosophy and it must be work-

able. It must not avoid issues. It must be a plan which will commend itself to the interests of capital and which will appeal to the sense and reason of labor. It must help capital to safe and profitable activity; and it must hold out the utmost of opportunity to the children of the poor. It can not do that if in any way it aids one at the expense of the other. If it is a real educational advance it will go, because no one in America can then stand against it. One who hinders the opportunities of capital is a fool. One who would lay sticks in the way of any son or daughter of the nation making the most of himself or herself is not an American. Even though his blood traces back to the *Mayflower* he is an alien and not of us. The clock is striking the hour for the full exploitation of our democracy in our education and in our industries, and no one shall stop the wheels or turn the hands back upon the dial. But the plan must be thoroughly American. It can not be English, or French, or German, no matter how much there may be in their systems to commend them. Their ideals and their methods are not ours, for the inherent thought of the Republic is very exclusively its own. It will be absurd not to have full information. It will be ridiculous to reject what will serve us simply because another people has worked it out before we have. But there is no other people with our outlook and expectations. We may adapt but well may be cautious about adopting. Essentially we must create. And if we go ahead in the spirit of the Republic, guided by its political philosophy, we may do it without fear and with confidence. Any arrangement which does not articulate with the work of the elementary schools, and which does not recognize the need of progressive continuity, with some definite aim, from the first grade in the primary school up to the point where the child is capable of earning a living, will not succeed or endure. Of course it involves much recasting of the plan of the elementary schools. They will have to be relieved of many studies, of much tiring attenuation and repetition in the same studies, of much psychological speculation and wearying preaching about methods in teaching. In the elementary schools, at least, the teachers will have to be allowed to teach, and not be kept from it by officials who are wandering and wondering about what kind of teaching is of the most worth. The value of the time element in the life of the child will have to be recognized. He will have to be taken in hand early, taught exact things, given power rather than information, and pushed along rapidly enough to be in pos-

session of the implements of an intellectual workshop by the time he is fourteen years of age. The class of work which the school is doing will have to be abreast of the age and capacity of the pupils, and public sentiment will have to refuse to tolerate the superintendent or the teacher who wastes the life of a child. More regular attendance must be exacted, more intensiveness put into the work, and the child brought to the end of the essential parts of the present elementary course by the time at which the law now allows him to leave the schools altogether. Then, in all considerable towns there will have to be established a wholly new order of public schools. These new schools will have to come immediately after and connect with the work in the primary schools. They will have to teach trades. They will have to respond to the local situation, teaching any trade when, say, twenty pupils apply for it. From the very beginning the elementary schools will have to have this in view. Aside from these schools, teaching individual trades, it will be necessary to develop another kind of school of a more general character for the children who are to go into the offices and stores and factories. The evening schools, which have got started upon a very indefinite plane, may be utilized, but they will need much more support and a substantial reorganization.

We must cease declaring that we are attempting only to train all-around mechanics, trying only to dignify labor, trying only to culture the mind through the hand, and have no thought of teaching those who are to work with their hands how to do something definite. That is the very trouble with the schools now. They are without exactness; they are profligate of boys and girls; they lack definite ends which the masses may see are worth gaining. They must advance from "manual training" to technical schools and trades schools. The "culturists" must not be allowed to appropriate the technical and trades schools to their own refined uses.

If the trades schools are to succeed they must have the sympathy and aid of the labor organizations. And they will have that aid and sympathy if they are at least as much shops as schools; if they magnify doing and minimize talking; if they are taught by artisans who can establish their power to train, rather than by theorists who are indifferent mechanics; if they really prepare children to begin work, and train out of them the conceit that they know all that can be learned only through much work and many years; and if, in the unfortunate but inevitable contentions between capital and labor, they stand fair and evenly helpful to both. The

higher technical schools must of course multiply and strengthen. They are the main hope of superior products in factories where the work is done by machinery, and it is hardly too much to say that they are the main hope of superior manhood and womanhood in a land given to invention and almost submerged in machinery. But they have little to do with the great army who are to work outside of factories and without machinery, in carrying on the building industries. There is no conflict. Let us have whatever kind of a school the interests of a town demand. It is only necessary to recognize the fact that the common power must establish, and the common purse must support, schools which will qualify hand workers quite as much as head workers, for their vocations; and that schools which do it must be flexible enough to meet local situations. It seems as though the trades schools and technical schools must have oversight and necessary control over children for three or four years after they finish the primary schools and until they are seventeen or eighteen years of age, but not so far as to preclude them from regular employment and some wages. The industrial schools will have to be open afternoons and evenings and have such time of the pupil as he can give, with a minimum of four or five hours each week, and the employers will have to reckon with this public exaction upon the time of the pupil. As a child comes to the end of the elementary school his parents and he may well elect whether he shall go to a trades school, or to a technical school, or to the high school, or to work. If he has a liking for hand work and is in a nonmanufacturing city, he may well choose a trades school; if in a manufacturing city, he will probably go to work in a factory, unless he has a fancy for a particular trade. It should be quite possible for him to take advantage of a trades school, or of a technical school, or of an all-around evening school, where the work will be of real interest to him. And in any event he should be required to respond to the oversight of the schools until he is prepared to begin, and has gained some interest in, an industrial vocation, or has started on the road towards a professional vocation, or has proved that his is a hopeless case. It will be said that all this means many more schools, many more buildings, the training of many more teachers, the recasting of present courses, great changes in the common thought and the common talk, much new legislation, and much additional expense to municipalities and to states. Of course that will be said. And it will be true. But there is no transgression about the movement that will have to be

repented of. It has no smack of paternalism, or of socialism, or of charity. It does not make gifts. It does not provide dinners, or clothes, or even medical attendance, for anybody. It means nothing but work. It preaches the gospel of self-dependence and of self-respect. Having gone as far as we have, to be just we must do this much more. It is now within the rights of every child, as much as the elementary and the secondary schools are within his rights. But even that is not all. The rational equilibrium between the exclusively intellectual and the decidedly industrial interests of the country must be restored and can hardly be restored without it. And not only the industrial efficiency, and the strength and balance of the nation, but the moral and intellectual health, and the solidarity, and soundness, and aggressiveness of the nation seem to depend upon it. The democracy of the nation will have to do it. Even more, the success of democracy rests upon it.

THE DEMOCRATIC ADVANCE IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

ADDRESS AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
MAINE, JUNE 9, 1908

The differences already well developed in the universities of the older and the newer states of the Union, and the relations which those differences sustain to the history and the outlook of each university and of the people of each state, make as fascinating a chapter as any to be found in the absorbing story of American education. And the futures of the institutions to which such differences point, and the bearing of those futures upon the common and progressive community life in the East and West of the country, are as encouraging to those who have interest and confidence in the body of the people as they are bewildering to those who are unable to suppress a shiver at the natural advance of democracy in America.

The departures of our newer universities from the foundations, the government, the plans, and the ideals of the older ones are many and decisive enough, but there is no reason why they should be very surprising. The evolution of universities in all countries has been very consistent. Political and economic conditions have ordinarily given them form and outlook, and the general intellectual freedom and balanced sanity of their constituencies have determined their undertakings and gauged the true value of their accomplishments. Our universities in the newer West have responded, and are responding, more readily and decisively than those in the older East to the universal rule. The reasons for this are discoverable.

An institution whose function is to prove a thesis rather than to find the truth is not a university. An institution set up to propagate a spiritual philosophy, or a political theory, or a scientific belief, or a cult of any kind, is not a university. An institution limited by social exclusiveness, or religious bigotry, or overheated partizanship of any kind, is not a university. An institution which merely polishes the rich who will never gain much strength through work, never know the pleasure of real accomplishment, never have the genuine culture which grows out of association and service, is not a university. Of course, universities will propagate religious

philosophies, and political constitutions, and scientific opinions; of course, universities will support some partizan views and activities, as they will discourage others; and of course, universities will minister to one community, and sometimes to one class in a community, more than to another: but unless an institution puts the truth above theory, while it repels the fanciful and unsubstantial; unless it opens the door of opportunity to all, while it aids the intellectual interests of every part, and applies scientific principle and fact to the doings of every class; and unless it seeks the light of all knowledge, quickens all who may come within its influence, and takes the initiative in drawing men and women into it through reaching out and doing things, it certainly lacks the essential attributes of a typical university in America.

The intellectual advance has been along a rough road. Something had to occur which would put faith above submission, and doing above dreaming: that something was Christianity. Something had to occur which would set the world in motion: that something was Protestantism. Then something further had to occur, because the new religion became as intellectually unrelenting as the old: that something was denominationalism. Then toleration, that is, freedom for all religion, and obedience to law rather than force, had to come; and that was constitutionalism. With this, men had their chance and study gained its free opportunity. Investigation, discovery and invention did their splendid work, made the accumulated knowledge of the ages available to all, and proved that concord was better than strife, and that cooperation was yet better than competition in helping on the great ends of civilization: and that is modernism.

Names and forms are often misleading. There is more real democracy among some peoples who live under monarchical forms of government which they have inherited, than among some peoples who live under republican forms which have grown out of accident more than intelligent design. There is more real subserviency among some peoples whose government is republican in form, than among other peoples whose government is monarchical in form. But wherever real religious freedom is and is valued, there intellectual freedom and civic freedom find an abiding place also. And where these have come to be, there the noblest universities have developed and there they have steadily grown, through the increasing volume and strength of the mighty forces which support them.

Nowhere have these forces sprung into luxuriance of life more

freely or more rapidly than in this country. Nowhere have universities responded to the freedom and the force of democracy more admirably than here. In no other land has the building of new states marked the advance of democracy, of constitutionalism, of modernism, as has the march of the armies of pioneers in the last half century from the Atlantic to the Pacific ocean, across North America. And nowhere else in all the world has the birth and the progress of real universities illustrated the universal rules of intellectual progress as they are exemplified by the advance of the tax-supported university movement in America.

The mental processes, the optimistic temperaments, the disposition to tolerate one another and to work together for the upbuilding of common institutions, everywhere manifest in the Mississippi valley, Rocky mountain, and Pacific coast states, and very often in the Southern States, are further removed from those which prevail in the North Atlantic States than those which are common in New England are removed from those which were common in Old England at the time of the Puritan revolution. The Western States have had a free intellectual field, and they have had the kind of people who knew that they possessed the political power, and were not afraid to make the most of it. They have had solid satisfaction in sacrificing and suffering to the end that their institutions might be better than any others, and that their children and their children's children might fare better than they themselves did. Their spirit has been transmitted and diffused: it prevails universally. They are not only disposed; they are informed. They know infinitely more of the East than the people of the East know of the West. They not only know: they are determined. That is the reason why in every state from the Ohio river to the Pacific coast, there is a real and a free university which has built upon the old models where it would and departed from them when it liked, and thereby well expresses the age, the strength, the intelligence, and the aspirations of the state. And their thinking is such that they would be ashamed if it were not so.

Colleges came quickly after the beginnings of the English settlements in America. They were ecclesiastical and denominational. They were not only Puritan or Cavalier, Conformist or Nonconformist, but their chief ends were the mere creeds and forms which the sects worshipped. Classical literature and sectarian theology measured the breadth of their arbitrary courses, and dogmatic instruction and catechetical inquiry as arbitrarily fixed the limits of

their intellectual freedom. The independence of America propagated sects, and sects propagated sectarian colleges. Opposed as these were to any learning which did not support the theses to which they gave their lives, there was energy in the very rivalry and hope in the very opposition. Learning made some headway; real religion had a better chance; the common needs and the compounded sense opened the way for toleration, and the absolute demands of respectability, if not of existence, made policies which rendered imperative the leveling or the ignoring of the fences between the sects. Progress came in the natural order.

In the early days religion and politics, the church and the state, went together. It had not yet developed that there could be a democracy of learning in an autocratic state, or that learning could be fettered through constitutions and laws and usages which assume to be very democratic and free. Indeed, there were those in high station who were foolish enough to think that they could use a college to fetter freedom, for an English court granted a college charter to what is now one of the greatest and most justly honored of American universities, in order "to prevent the spread of republican principles which were already become altogether too common." It was part of a fatuous but fruitful policy; in twenty-five years the gun which signaled the greatest democratic advance that mankind has ever known in learning as well as in political progress "was heard round the world."

The early secondary school system, that is, the academies, of the Atlantic States, was projected from the top down, rather than from the bottom up as it was in the West. It sprang out of the need of the colleges for feeders, rather than out of the impulse of the masses for higher schools. The earlier colleges and academies were naturally, and perhaps necessarily enough, aristocratic rather than democratic institutions. They followed the English political thought and the English educational plan. The public high school movement was infinitely more democratic than aristocratic and it developed relatively very much earlier and very much more freely and luxuriantly in the West than in the East, because there it found a more democratic atmosphere and did not meet the indifference of the leaders of education and the active opposition of institutions already upon the ground.

The early colleges in the West, like those in the East, were ecclesiastical and denominational, but commonly they were little more than high schools, and often their support was so precarious that

they could assert but little opposition to a popular educational advance. In practically every case the tendency to advance educationally was so democratic and popular as to be overwhelming, no matter what the sectarian opposition or educational blindness.

Every western town grew up with an enthusiastic purpose to have all that the East had educationally, with something to spare. The East felt sorry for the West, and the spirit that would go West could not endure that. In every town, from the Ohio river to the Pacific coast, the most conspicuous building is that of the public high school, and it seldom happens that that building does not shelter a school which is quite as well organized and quite as efficient as the school in any eastern town of similar size and equal wealth. Very often it is better organized and much more efficient. And it must not be forgotten that the towns all the way to the Pacific coast are no longer small, and certainly it must not be overlooked that they are no longer poor. Very generally they have come to be strong and rich, and very commonly their high schools are the best expression of their wealth and their intellectual progress. There is a keen and universal pride in the institution, a sense of common proprietorship in it, and a wide appreciation of the fact that it is a unique American institution, a "people's college," a connecting link between the public schools and a real college or a real university, all of which is much more marked than in the Atlantic States.

Soon the Western States came to be quite as enthusiastic about colleges as about high schools. The natural order proceeded. It was stronger because it rested upon the earth and grew upward. Long before the Civil War, nearly every western state that had then been admitted to the Union had come in with a provision in its constitution for a state university, and since that time there has doubtless been no exception whatever. It was no mere form. In nearly every case that provision has been conscientiously and generously observed. The result appears in a very systematic, a very coherent, and a highly efficient state educational system with a continuing road leading from every primary school through sixteen grades to the graduate school in the state university.

It will not do to assume that the western state universities established in the constitutions, and, in fact, before the war, were merely low grade industrial affairs. They were more classical than industrial. They did not at first break away, to any great extent, from eastern and old world ideals. They were organized, planned and

administered, in nearly every case, by classical scholars. Of course they were under democratic influences and of course they soon began to bend to the practical needs of the people of their states, but it took long years to break away from the roads which educational conventionalism had made for them, and break out the new roads which would give learning its largest and widest opportunity among a people who had put themselves at the fore of national progress. But in time they found the way to realize their fundamental political thought and give every one his chance; and they also found the way to put those universities to the uses of democratic states.

Before the Civil War there was no real university in this country, either East or West—that is, real in its strength, its offerings, its outlook, its freedom, and its spirit. The greatest uplift which has ever come to university education in America, or in any land, came in the Federal Land Grant Act on the darkest day of the Civil War. The day after the awful disaster on the Chickahominy, the day upon which Lincoln called for 300,000 more men and hundreds of millions more of money, he made a law of the act of Congress giving to each state for higher education 30,000 acres of land for each senator and representative that the state had in Congress.

There has been much discussion, and there is yet some, as to the intent of this act, as between classical and industrial education. The discussion is now academic and no longer fascinating. The intent has been construed and determined in action accomplished. In spirit and situation the West was able to take the benefits of the act much more clearly and strongly than was the East. Fathered by a Vermont senator, it was yet essentially a western act. It proceeded from the agitation of Jonathan Turner, an Illinois teacher. The act laid down some conditions. Three or four things must be done. There was little or no eastern sentiment in favor of those things, and the educational puritanism at Harvard and Yale and Columbia and Princeton was too solemn and ponderous to compromise a classical orthodoxy for lands or money. The act contemplated that each state should use its avails to enlarge existent institutions, or join forces and build up new institutions. The New England States managed in one way and another to get hold of the proceeds of the federal act, but they have never entered into the spirit of it. It is doubtful if any one of them has given as much to the joint enterprise as it has received from the federal grants. It is certain that they have never made the most, nor much,

of them. The spirit of New York was no better; perhaps not even as good. But the scholarship and intuitions of Andrew D. White, formerly a professor at the University of Michigan, and then in the New York Senate, and the philanthropy and sagacity of Ezra Cornell, then also in the New York Senate, did something to save the State from its annoying indifference and stupidity.

Beyond the Alleghenies, moneys and opportunities have never been allowed to escape. In many states mechanical and agricultural colleges were annexed to colleges of liberal arts already established. In others technical colleges were started, and, where this was done, classical attachments were soon added. As a consequence, there is no state west of the Ohio river which does not possess, and is not committed to, a common university for common ends. In its foundations, and generally in its superstructure, it is a real university. Whenever a new state has been formed, it has come into the Union with plans for a common university, as well matured and as strongly sustained as the state's plans for common schools. All learning is the universal passion. It is hardly too much to say that there is no state beyond the Ohio which has not supplemented the federal grants with much more than it has ever received from them, and it is certain that many of those states give much more to their universities every year than they have received from the general government from the beginning.

Of course there are results; and of course the results are largest where the democracy is the freest, where there is the most unity of ambition and of purpose, and where the people hold the initiative and the power and are fully aware of it. The country will in time discover, if it has not done so already, that that is the most encouraging factor in our national life.

It is not possible to name any number of higher American institutions, in the order of number of teachers and of students, cubage under roofs, libraries, laboratories and equipment, range of offerings, recognized standards of efficiency, number of degrees conferred, annual revenues, and influence upon life, without finding that more than half of them are tax-supported institutions. Forty-one states have institutions which confer the A.B. degree; the five others have institutions which do not confer this degree, and four of the five are in New England. No one can justly say that the growth of democratic universities in the United States is not one of the most marvelous and gratifying movements in the entire history of world education.

The phases of this movement which exemplify its democracy are more surprising and significant than are its proportions. The common assumption, the inherited tradition, of the old universities is exclusiveness. They have decided *what* learning is worth propagating: only choice spirits of their own selection have been admitted. The tests of admission have related exclusively to the things which they are accustomed to do, rather than to universality of opportunity; to culture, rather than to the work which makes for culture; to the mere ability to pass written examinations set by teachers who know nothing of the other attributes of the candidates, rather than to the general qualities and experiences which make it reasonable to expect that the candidates will do their work. The fundamental basis of tax-supported institutions is that all learning is of worth which bears upon the common life and applies scientific principles to the ordinary and useful occupations; that every one, who has given evidence of desire and of reasonable capacity for it, shall have his opportunity; and that the institution itself must initiate movements, take up inquiries, and pursue policies which will quicken the intellectual activities, sharpen the moral sense, and help on the business interests of as many factors as possible in a constituency that recognizes no special privileges but worships universal rights.

The lack of information, indeed the persistent misinformation, in the Eastern States concerning these institutions, makes it well to be exact. I will briefly describe one of them so that he who cares to verify may do so. It is not the oldest, or the largest, or the greatest. It is typical of the others—the normal product of the intellectual outlook, the industrial conditions, the prosperous up-building, and the religious freedom and virile politics which have grown up around the flag of the Union as it has moved to the westward.

This university was established forty years ago. It was erected upon the "Grand Prairie," a great region where ordinary farm lands are worth \$150 to \$200 per acre. It owns and uses six hundred and twenty acres of the best land. It has cultivated and planted until it has as attractive grounds as any university in America. It has produced environing cities. It has twenty-five substantial buildings, and is adding one or two more every year. Probably it has more cubage under roof than any other educational institution in the country. It has revenues of more than a million a year for operating expenses, without a dissenting voice

in the Legislature. It has more than 500 in its faculties and more than 4700 students taking courses in the university proper, in its colleges of arts, science, engineering, agriculture, law, medicine, and dentistry, and in its schools of library science, music, pharmacy and education. Associated with the university are the United States Agricultural Experiment Station, the State Engineering Experiment Station, the State Laboratory of Natural History, the State Water Survey, and the State Geological Survey. Of course, most of the students come from the state, but more than forty other states and ten foreign countries are represented in the student body.

But for the fact that some good souls have a hardened disdain for "cornfield universities," it might not be worth mentioning that this institution has rather more than the ordinary university equipment of fraternities and fraternity houses, sororities and sorority houses, clubs and clubhouses, dress suits and dress gowns, and all the other solidities and frivolities which offset the things that crucified the flesh in ancient scholasticism. Its ordinary processionals are as impressively academic as one ever sees in an eastern state save when a new college president is inaugurated or a centennial is observed; and its receptions are as radiant and as "formal" as ordinary people can endure. Its life is much in the open; some form of athletics is universal. Its athletics and its intercollegiate contests have been clean. Harvard, Yale, Princeton and Pennsylvania are very well aware that it can play ball.

For a dozen years much care has been given to the military department in this university. It is popular. It is in charge of a veteran officer of the regular army with a record which appeals to young men of spirit. All freshmen and sophomores drill about two hours a week. The cadet organization consists of a band of fifty men, an infantry regiment of thirteen hundred men, a battery of artillery with two field guns, a signal corps, hospital corps, etc. On occasions, such as a university celebration or the inauguration of a governor, it makes a profound public impression. On Saturday afternoons, once a month, through the winter it holds a "hop" at the armory. Young men and women go together, in daylight, and there is nothing wonderful about it: they present themselves to a receiving line of members of the faculties and officers of the regiment, and learn, and observe, and are advantaged by, the forms of polite society. The military organization is wholesome and inspiring. It "sets up" men: it makes one place at least where

authority and obedience are absolute; and it appeals to the pride and patriotism, while it adds to the strength, of the state.

In this university there is a Christian Association for men and another for women. They have probably two thousand members and own buildings, overlooking the campus, worth \$150,000, which friends and teachers and students have given. And they are quite as active and efficient, and religion is quite as virile and as free, as in any denominational institution.

It is but the truth to say that this university is the best expression, and the best inspiration, of the great soul of a sane and properly ambitious people, and of a prosperous and zestful state which is able to govern and proposes to do so. Happily, in nearly every other American state there is a similar exemplification and inspiration of the thinking of a people who know the throbbings of individual spirit and of a public soul.

This university has recently been invited to membership in the Association of American Universities, which comprises the fifteen leading universities of the country. Its graduate school, or the university proper, has grown steadily since 1892. There are now one hundred and eighty students doing research work, and fifty-two other colleges and universities are represented. The last Legislature gave, without dissent, \$50,000 per annum for additional instruction in the graduate school alone.

Now let us point out the very decisive differences between this and the traditional universities of the world. First of all, the warp and woof are of a wholly new kind of material. The atmosphere that blows across the campus has a new stimulus in it. It is a people's university: it is supported by the people. There is no assumption from that that every man who comes along, or every society that has a mission, can dictate its policies or coerce its action. Neither is there an assumption that a few men monopolize the knowledge of what is good for a whole people. Its trustees are elected at the general election, and are commonly reelected. They are not unreasonable in their thinking: never more than one or two at a time are disposed to selfishness, and such at once learn that they can not gratify their greed. The policies of the institution are wrought out upon the anvil of public discussions, at the council tables of the trustees and the faculties, and in the great forum of the state, and are expressive of the compounded thought of scholarship and of the whole people. The institution does not have to plead with donors; it is not limited by conditions in deeds of trust: it does not *have*

to worship tombs. Its government is that of a constitutional democracy; not even that of a constitutional monarchy. It is not fettered by crown, or cabinet, or minister; by primate, or caste, or party. It has all the factors of self-expansion within its own organization, and it has more liberty in working out its destiny than has ever been enjoyed by any other kind of university in the world.

Tuition is free. It was the original scheme of the land grant act that, in order to make certain that all of its proceeds should be used for instruction, each state should provide buildings. The state did this and began charging a term fee of less than \$25 per year to each student, to meet the expense of repairs to buildings. The need of this fee has long since disappeared, and, indeed, the reason of it has for the most part been forgotten, but its influence upon the student body has been so salutary that it has been continued. When its abolition has been suggested, the students have protested and have taken occasion to propose the ways in which they would be glad to have the money used. But there are something like a thousand meritorious and absolutely free scholarships, and the door never swings against a student because he has a lean or empty pocketbook.

This democratic university is a part of the public school system of the state. It is the thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth grades in that system. Its officers and agents lay out the work of the high schools and inspect and rate them for organization and efficiency; then it admits to its work all who are certified to have completed the work in the approved high school courses: this ordinarily requires four years, but is sometimes done in three. The plan unifies the whole educational system. It keeps the high schools up to grade. Their faculties can not afford to have it said that their work does not have the approval of the State University. The admission requirements at the university have steadily advanced: they are above the average of the leading universities. Still, the State University cares less about who is *admitted* than who is *graduated*. The western people want every one to have his chance. They say if he falls down after having his chance, it is his fault. The western students have a tradition that it is not difficult to get into a western university, but exceedingly hard to maintain one's self and get a degree; while it is harder to get into an eastern university, but that one who gets in always gets through. There is something in that. In any event, the western method unifies and

energizes the educational system, and affords the open chance for a college degree to an extent which is wholly unappreciated in the Eastern States.

The western university is coeducational. In the one described there are a thousand women, that is, one in four students. There have never been any scandals. There is less foolishness on the part of one sex concerning the other than there is in either a man's college or a woman's college. There is no evasion. Men and women measure up in the presence of one another. Once in a while a "match" results, and in practically every case it is a good one. It is the only way of assuring entire educational justice and equality to women. It enforces university attention for the special interests of women as well as for those of men. Accepted in the spirit it is, it exerts a sane and keen influence upon all of the activities of the university and upon many of the higher interests of the state.

But perhaps a more potential difference than any other appears in the fact that the state university feels bound to take the initiative in promoting every intellectual interest, and in aiding every business interest of the people of the state. The common thought is not merely that the university is a place where students may go if some exclusive authority will let them in, but that it is a place where all who are qualified to partake of the highest, the broadest, and the most diversified learning may go as of right, and a place to which the people may turn for the solution of their problems, whether those problems are intellectual or industrial, whether they are public or private, and whether they concern the nation, the state, or a county, or municipality thereof.

Its library school propagates libraries everywhere. Its political science departments supply information upon timely political and economic subjects. Its department of sanitary engineering tells towns how to lay sewers, and supplies specifications for pavements. Its department of chemistry analyzes several thousand specimens of drinking water for the people every year, without charge. Its department of railway engineering has test cars of its own running over all the steam and electric roads of the state to aid the companies in improving the right of way and in getting a maximum of speed and safety at a minimum of cost. Its department of mechanical engineering shows the towns how to abate the smoke nuisance. Its engineering experiment station works with the manu-

facturing and constructive interests to assure the best methods and machinery. Its colleges of medicine and law not only assume responsibility about training for, but undertake to guard the doorways to, those professions. Its department of art looks after the drawing in all of the schools, and its department of architecture exerts an influence upon large buildings from one side of the state to the other. Its college of agriculture tells the farmers how lands may be put to more profitable use, how particular soils need to be treated, and what processes will put more fat matter into corn and into cattle as well. This spring the university I have referred to sent one of its leading professors to the Argentine Republic to see if some of the vast herds of heavy cattle in South America can be brought into our markets; another to Denmark, to study dairying in the most successful dairy country in the world; and this summer it is sending its president to the different countries of Europe to get into the heart of veterinary science, with a view to the organization of a great veterinary college for the benefit of a great city and a great state that have vast investments in the animal industries. Illustrations might be multiplied to the wearying point, but these few are sufficiently significant.

Of course, men seasoned in the old conceptions of colleges and universities have things to say about this outworking of our democracy in our higher education. They say, for example, that it is no function of the state to supply such advanced training. The overwhelming sentiment and the laws of the country have determined that it is. They talk about the public universities having their "hands in the public treasury." It would be as senseless, but no more senseless, to retort that some people have their hands in private pockets. Ours is a representative democracy, and when so important a matter as this is well understood among the people for half a century, and the lawmaking power decrees it again and again with practical or entire unanimity, it is time to assume that it has the right to be and that it is well.

Again, they say that the influence of a large institution upon the individual student is not so good as that of the small institution, that the stronger teachers are in the small colleges, and that the students come in closer contact with them. That is a matter of opinion. In my opinion the influence of the great institution is the better. The association with many other students levels conceits and stimulates ambition. There is great advantage in the multi-

plicity of work, in the many entertainments, lectures, and discussions, in the innumerable activities of every thinkable kind. Students absorb much from the larger world and from the courses other than their own. The assumption that there are teachers of stronger character and firmer moral sense, and of better training and teaching power, in the smaller institutions than in the larger ones, and in the older ones than in the newer ones, is wholly unwarranted. And the lack of contact between teacher and student in the larger institutions is purely imaginative.

They say, sometimes, that the state universities are "Godless" because undenominational. On the contrary, religion is freer, religious discussion more spontaneous, and religious activities more numerous and potential, because they are many-denominational. This consideration goes far in explanation of the unprecedented growth of the state universities. Real universities do not exist to propagate a creed or bind youth to a denomination, and most parents, who do not put sectarianism above religion and form above substance, think of this when planning about the future of their children.

Yet again, "they say," that the public universities are dominated by "politics." Nothing could be further from the truth. There is absolutely nothing of it. Of course, when a state is being formed and an institution is being born, the mere politicians will seek control of everything, and two or three instances of this in connection with the formative period of public universities have attracted the attention of the country. But even in such cases the imperative and fundamental principles of university life and efficiency soon assert themselves. The people quickly resent it. The state universities which have got their bearings, as practically all have, are wholly free from politics. Indeed, the people are exceedingly sensitive about this matter, and the interests of all parties give the best assurance of protection from the depredations of politics. And, moreover, it is but just to observe that the essential basis of a tax-supported university makes it particularly independent of caste, wealth, social blindness, educational bigotry, party politics, or partizanship of any other kind.

Still again, it is said that the state universities have grown up in states where there was a lack of colleges, and because of that fact. This is not so. The states having the strongest state universities have more good colleges than has any state in New England. Ohio has thirty, Michigan ten, Wisconsin eight, Minnesota eight, Illinois

twenty-eight, of which two are great universities with more than four thousand students each; Indiana fifteen, Kansas nineteen, Nebraska nine, Iowa twenty-four, Missouri twenty, etc., etc. But this is not all. It is a notable fact that where these other colleges have taken rather kindly to the principles of the state university, have recognized its right to be, have helped it along and been themselves influenced by it, they have prospered; and where they have opposed it, they have suffered. If notable it ought not to be surprising, for it accords with the universal rule in morals and education, that the best way to help yourself is to help another; but it is significant of the feeling and purpose in America concerning education.

Once more, it is said or implied that the plane of scholarship in the state universities is low. That is a question of fact about which it is better to seek information than to indulge in epithet. A fair sample of the minimum admission requirements in a state university is 15 units of preparatory work, a unit representing 180 recitations of 45 minutes each. This exacts four years work in four designated secondary subjects. The secondary schools are as efficient as similar institutions in the East. The students are as earnest and zestful. Few of them are very rich, and fewer still very poor; they have come from good average homes, they are as enthusiastic, ambitious, and proud as any similar number of students anywhere in the country. The university offerings are even more numerous and varied than in the traditional universities. If there is anything that they want in the way of investigation or instruction, they can get it. It is true that the demands for classical languages, literatures, and history, are not overwhelming, but any who want them can get their fill. In the multiplicity of work of real human interest, bearing upon vocations and upon life and upon the prevailing activities and the common interests, or actually fundamental to real professions, the universities west of the Ohio are often far ahead of their eastern colleagues. They keep students much more regularly at work and their semester examinations are more exacting, arbitrary, and resultful. Often their law and medical schools are not yet up to the grade of such professional schools in the East, but in the natural and political sciences which provide foundations to the professions, they are inferior to none. And they are breaking out roads with their professional schools and with all of their graduate work.

Sneering at tax-supported colleges and universities evidences paucity of information, or logic that limps. Many new institutions have been developed in this country. Many old institutions have taken new form here. Oftener than otherwise this has been so in our pioneer life while our society was yet, as it were, in the liquid state. Educational ambition and freedom had some opportunity and made some headway upon the Atlantic seaboard, and in the early days of our history. The miles of sea and land between the habits and the organized life of the old world and the needs of the new world, gave some chance to progress and some opportunity to the instruments of progress, from the very beginning. And much happened in a colonial life which led up to, and gained, and was able to preserve, independence and nationality. But aside from that, there was not much advance in the way of religious toleration, or political freedom, or of educational organization, or of the expression of a people's life in a distinctive literature, until after national independence. *That* not only made a new nation but it made a new life. With it the march of great pioneer armies to the Pacific was commenced. Those armies have augmented in numbers and gained in strength as they have gone westward. They have had quite as much ambition and exaltation of purpose, quite as much information and intellectual power, as New England and New York in *their* pioneer days. They have found far richer lands, and far more productive mines than their fathers ever dreamed of; and that fact has already become great in the nation's evolution, and is doubtless to be far greater. Material prosperity has given them the wealth with which to build and the strength with which to do. With all the newness, they have never lacked in the power to govern; but even better than that, they have never permitted government enough to hinder or subvert the freedom of their intellectual and moral initiative. So, new and typical institutions of learning have grown out of the steady advance and the gradual unfolding of the nation toward the setting sun.

The Atlantic States have often scouted these new institutions just as Old England scouted some of the early ideas of New England. But the result will be the same. Perhaps the most conspicuous of these new institutions is the public university. It does not accord with the "New England idea" which a committee of the Legislature of Maine has defined as "free public schools and a degree of compulsory attendance, with higher education and pro-

professional training at the cost of the individual rather than of the state." But the "New England idea" will have to give way. Wherever our society has become well congealed, there has been stout opposition to every advance of the mass toward higher education. New England and New York developed quite as stubborn opposition to the public high school as is likely to appear against the tax-supported university. The thing is going. The movement is now from the West to the East. The city of New York, the other day, dedicated buildings costing \$7,000,000 for a new and free university. In twenty-five years' time the boys and girls of the East, as well as those of the West, will have their open chance in state or municipal universities as broad and as efficient as any in the land; and cities and states will use universities to break out the roads for their own intellectual and industrial upbuilding. Very likely, in states where there are already excellent universities upon private foundations, there will be some adjustments to that fact on the part of the newer institutions; but, if there are, there will have to be very considerable readjustment on the part of the older institutions also. The democracy of the United States is working its way out in education. Our circumstances are special and our tendencies very distinct. There is a spirit moving among the masses, and it will not stop short of the equal chance for every one.

In the democracy of learning which is being erected in this country there will be ultimately no state lines, no zones of ignorance and learning bounded by rivers or mountains, and no barriers established by artificial exclusiveness. The basis of opportunity will be manhood and womanhood; and the right to make the most of one's self will depend only upon the desire and the power to do. The time will come when every state and every considerable municipality will use a real and a free university to gain the great ends for which democracies exist. The higher learning will be still higher in the future than now. The assurance of it is in the open chance for all assured by our fundamental political beliefs and in the political power of the common people.

THE ADAPTATION OF THE SCHOOLS TO INDUSTRY AND EFFICIENCY

ADDRESS BEFORE THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, AT CLEVELAND, OHIO, JUNE 29, 1908

Mr President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the National Education Association, and, incidentally but particularly, you, my long-time friends of the Cleveland Public Schools:

The honor of a summons to address this association, so completely representative of American schools, so great in its history, and so wide in its influence, is accompanied by an obligation which one may well accept with hesitation and approach with humility. And when the subject assigned is one which has the attention of the nation and looks to the decisive re-forming of the schools, and particularly when it is one which lends itself to the round-table much better than to the general assembly, and, more particularly still, when you evince such a decided preference for song and violin as you have tonight, one must bespeak your consideration, if he does not fall upon his knees and plead for your patience.

We are within the territory which the first great moral act of the Republic, looking to the upbuilding of the nation, in words as solemn as any a statute could employ, dedicated to freedom, to virtue, and to learning forever. We are met at the very heart of the "Reserve" where New England and New York pioneers, as sincere and forceful men and women as ever came out of the mass to seek opportunity and advance civilization, in prayer and act even more meaningful than an ordinance of congress, dedicated themselves and their posterity to the propositions that men and women are created with equality of moral and intellectual, as well as of legal right; that government is a common need and a common good when moved by moral sense; and that government for any other end than the moral good of the governed deserves the enmity, rather than the adhesion, of men. We are met in a great, busy, prosperous city, which has never given over its moral sense, which has always been alert about its freedom, and which has therefore never been indifferent about its schools.

And, while I well know that not a very large number will understand it, I am glad to feel assured that there are still some good people in this great throbbing city, and not a few fine teachers in its excellent schools, who will believe that grateful memories and fruitful recollections crowd to the fore as I look over this radiant assembly and offer another word about the things which this association and this city hold to be of first concern.

A Message from England

We have just had an illuminating message from an accomplished officer of the English schools. His distinguished service to education, our undimmed recollections of the inspiring address he gave us seven years ago, and his resultful work since then in relating schools to industries, have led us to insist that he cross the sea again and speak to us once more upon the subject which is claiming the first attention of our people and our schools. His message is timely because it comes out of the full information and the sagacious outlook of a man who has put his own country and our country under obligations to him: it is more helpful than it otherwise would be because it comes out of the life of a mighty people, whose established habits of industry, whose sane and steady thinking, and whose unbending passion for freedom and for right, have given point and force to their influence upon every sea and in every land.

His message is none the less instructive because our national temperaments and political philosophies are at some points divergent, and because our dissimilarity of industrial conditions makes it impossible to adopt it in every detail. It will be even more instructive if we are able to associate the universality of fundamental principles with inevitable national differences in political and material situations. It would be as fatal for us to assume that a scheme of school organization or a plan of procedure which is adapted to one country must be adapted to another, as it would be to refuse to believe that the universal laws of sense, and the universal gospel of work, are as binding upon one people as upon another.

Half a dozen years ago it was my pleasure to show another distinguished officer of the English schools about one of our American free universities. We wandered through offices, and classrooms, and laboratories, and libraries, and shops, and gymnasiums, and then we drove through long avenues of shade trees, until he asked me to stop that he might look about and get a comprehensive view of the whole at once. As it all gathered in his mind he said, "And do you say that all this is free to all the people, and supported by self-imposed taxes upon all the people?" "Yes," I said, "and it is the tax which is voted without dissent and of which one never hears." He raised his face and hand, in expression more significant than his words, when he said, "There is nothing like it in human history."

Even true, it was not all of the truth. One must have an eye quickened by the American spirit and clarified by American history to see at once all the parts of the educational temple of which that

university is but one gem in a resplendent crown. No other eye can take in at a glance the universal systems of primary, and secondary, and collegiate, and professional schools, associated in an educational plan of unprecedented symmetry, closeness, and completeness, which affords to all the equal chance declared in our laws and enshrined in the hearts of all true Americans.

Other peoples do many things better than we do. In some directions their schools are more definite and efficient than ours. It is surely so with the simple schools for the peasant people. But there are no peasants in America. No other nation grasps the doctrine of all education for all the people as we do. We will never let go of that. It is the hope and the heritage of the nation. It is the boon which our democracy holds out to the honest, the ambitious, and the oppressed, in all the world.

It creates difficulties, and we must admit them. All education for all the people has been self-expansive and has come to be expressed in new ways with the advancement of the nation. We all know how situations and needs change in America. Plans laid yesterday have to be modified today. And remedy can not follow upon need as quickly in a country where conclusions must be reached through popular discussion and opinion must crystallize in free legislation, as in a country where a few do the most of the thinking and a minister or a cabinet exercises the political power for all of the rest.

My friend who has preceded me will not imagine that I am so unmindful of English history as to assume that Britain is a nation where a few men do the thinking and exercise the power for all of the rest. She settled that at Runnymede and again at Naseby, and Dunbar, and Marston Moor, and more than once on Tower Hill. She not only settled it for herself but for us. And since England's best writer of history, in the best history of the American Revolution that has been written, says that American heroism saved English freedom, my English friend will not mind if I say that *we* settled the question, for England as well as for ourselves, at Saratoga and at Trenton and at Yorktown, and then at Plattsburg and again at New Orleans, and many times by the gallantry of a little navy upon the high seas. The proudest jewel in England's crown doubtless is that we learned so well the great lessons which her statesmen and heroes taught us, and then supplemented them with some experiences and some independence of our own. All the stars upon our flag are the brighter because we have defended our democracy and our security so well. The foundations and the

buttresses of law are as firmly laid in America as in Britain, and they are no better grounded in any land. We are as sensitive about the learning and the independence of the courts as are the people who look up with keenest pride to the red cross of Saint George — and more than *that* can not be claimed in any land.

England has always set us a fine example of industry. She has not juggled with opportuneness so much as we have, perhaps because she has had less disposition to juggle, and less opportuneness to juggle with. Democracy, opportunities, and optimism have to be reckoned with in America: they often cause us to be misunderstood by England.

Whether or not we have a fateful craze for wealth, we hold in special honor riches justly gained and sanely used. Our adventurers and our weaklings gamble much upon the unlimited chances which the conditions present; a few win; the greater number go to "the deeps that are dumb." But the country is not all adventurer or weakling. The overwhelming sentiment is sane, and sound, and strong. We believe in capacity more than in chance, and in work more than in opportunity. We put manhood above either riches or poverty. We know that labor, and skill, and prudence, and steadiness, rather than great wealth, make the reliable character and the substantial citizen, and that these spring in the largest numbers and in the most virile type out of all education for the laborer just as much as for the millionaire, and for the commoner just as much as for the prince.

Britain has something of that to learn, and so with her constitutionalism and with the unfettered intellectual freedom of the Saxon race she has her own educational difficulties. If the mother country has fewer new situations to deal with, she seems to have greater difficulty about the principles which will have to be applied to all situations. The fact that her situations do not change so often is offset by the other fact that her more settled political and social organization yields less easily to the inevitable advance of the common people: and perhaps it is more than offset by the further fact that her statesmen are not quite as responsive to the democratic advance as ours, and that she does not change statesmen as often or as easily as we do. But we will both console ourselves with the reflection that educational troubles are the proof of educational energy and the assurance of educational progress; and we will be happy in the oneness of purpose which enables us to balance one another and quicken education in all the vast domains where the people understand the English tongue.

Lack of Industrialism in the Schools

Americans are as free in their right of censure as in any other of their freedoms. The elementary schools are everywhere, and often they find themselves within the intellectual limitations of senseless criticism. The loosening obligations of domestic duty and the very weaknesses of the schools have produced an undue supply of people of superficial culture and of "professionals" without employment; and the universal interest in education makes it quite possible for these to occupy themselves and perhaps gain a little standing by endless propositions about the schools. There is evidence enough that they are not slow to take advantage of it. The factors which these people have added and would add to the schools are the essential cause of a widespread difficulty to which it is high time that we address ourselves with determination and with force.

When but one third of the children remain to the end of the elementary course in a country where education is such a universal passion, there is something the matter with the schools. When half of the men who are responsible for the business activities and who are guiding the political life of the country tell us that children from the elementary schools are not able to do definite things required in the world's real affairs, there is something the matter with the schools. When work seeks workers, and young men and women are indifferent to it or do not know how to do it, there is something the matter with the schools.

The length of the school period and the productive value of the citizen are closely related. Industrialism is the great basis of a nation's true strength and real culture. Knowing this we have seen that there is not sufficient articulation between the educational and the industrial systems of the country. We have seen the indefinite expansion of instruction and the unlimited multiplication of appliances leading to literary, and professional, and managing occupations, without any real solicitude about the vital industrial foundations of the nation's happiness and power. A situation manifestly unjust to the greater number, even unjust to those for whom it has done the most, has resulted. Notwithstanding our boasted universality of educational opportunity, there has grown up an absurd hiatus in the educational system, which denies the just rights of the wage-earning masses and grievously menaces the industrial efficiency and the material prosperity of the country.

The overwhelming trend of the programs of the schools and of the influences of the teachers, acting upon our national tempera-

ment and aspirations, has led an undue proportion of youth to literary and scientific study which too often ends either in idleness and insipidity, or in professional or managing occupations for which they are not well prepared and which are already overcrowded.

Nor is the inevitable disappointment the worst of it. There is a glare, a gamble, and a subtlety about it which is demoralizing to all youth. In the marvelous advance and by some legerdemain, men get to be generals who have never been captains, and overseers who have never been workmen. That affronts the sense of the country. We believe in the natural order of progress. While we hold that any one may aspire to any place, we hold also that he must win it, not by pretence, nor by subtlety, nor by favor, but through the work which leads to it, and by the gradual accretion of the substantial qualities which are the only true basis of his right to it. We care very little what the work is. We say that one who may work and will not work is not to be taken seriously. We have more love for a forceful corporal than for an insipid colonel. We say that the only way to proficiency and the only claim upon respect, come through the reflex influence of much work upon the worker. We believe that one whose labor, either mental or manual, adds to the power and the assets of the world, has a wealth and a joy of his own to which the idler, no matter how rich, has no claim whatsoever.

I am aware that I am on sensitive ground and may be misunderstood, but I am confident that if I can make myself clear I shall be sustained by the substantial sentiment of the country. I am not urging manual as against intellectual labor, any more than intellectual as against manual labor. I am not saying that one should remain in the "class" in which he was born, for I know nothing of "classes" in America and I do not admit that any one in this country is ever born in a "class." Work makes the worker. The willing workman, whatever his poverty or his work, is likely to be a better citizen and a better man than the willing idler, whatever his riches or his superficial accomplishments. It is not a matter of "class" at all, but of the adaptation of men and women in general to the work which they can do best. I am not treating of exceptional cases, but surely I am not discouraging those of exceptional gifts, for all experience proves that the exceptional and the great have at first been injured to the severe labor which was at hand and that that very fact opened the door of opportunity, pointed the way to the thing which they could do best, and seasoned them for the doing of it.

It is a matter of efficiency, and therefore of happiness and growth, in occupation. What I am urging is that the schools must keep abreast, now and in time to come as they have been doing in time past, with the natural outworking of our democracy; that they shall not be exclusive in any sense, but must be no less concerned about industrial than about intellectual education. It is because I believe as ardently as I do in the open chance for every American child, that I say that the implications and the influences of the schools must not lead boys who might become excellent cabinetmakers into being no-account lawyers, and girls who might be first-class breadmakers or dressmakers into being fourth-class music teachers. The *best chance* of every one is through the thing that he can do best, and while the schools are to inspire and encourage him, they may well be on their guard lest in misguided enthusiasm of their own they turn him from the course which is likely to be the best for him.

All education must be provided in American schools, but conclusions about life occupations are not to be forced — not even by implications. Determinations are to be left to natural inclinations and to the fates which are kindly to those who have real inclination to actual work of any kind.

All this leads us to see that the school system has grown deformed: it is one-sided and not broad enough at the base. The trouble is not that the higher institutions have grown abnormally. They are doing what colleges and universities ought to do. They are not doing what they ought not to do. Free universities have become the finest expression of the souls of great states, and they are beginning to be the best expression of the souls of great cities, in all parts of the country. Nor is the difficulty in the secondary schools, although they are affected by it. The ailment is in the elementary schools.

Waste in the Elementary Schools

Our elementary schools train for no industrial employments. They lead to nothing but the secondary school, which in turn leads to the college, the university, and the professional school, and so very exclusively to professional and managing occupations. One who goes out of the school system before the end or at the end of the elementary course is not only unprepared for any vocation which will be open to him, but too commonly he is without that intellectual training which should make him eager for opportunity and

incite him to the utmost effort to do just as well as he can whatever may open to him. He goes without respect for the manual industries, where he might find work if he could do it. He is without the simple preparation necessary to definite work in an office or a store. He is neither clear about his English, nor certain about his figures. Parents often take their children from the elementary school before the end of the course, not only because they can not comprehend much that is being done, but because they feel that their children will not have more earning capacity for the work which they must expect to do if they stay than if they go.

The programs in the elementary schools are overloaded, and the teachers are overtaxed. The terms have become too short and the vacations too long, in the interest of teachers who are often overworked by schools that are too large and by programs that are too crowded and complex. But that is not the worst. There is too much pedagogy and too little teaching. There is too much artificial, and superficial, and therefore false, culture, and too little of the only thing that makes true culture. There are too many classes, too many books, too many visionary appliances. The teachers are forced into fanciful speculation and airy methods in order to be thought at the fore of pedagogical progress. There are pedagogical and psychological wretches who seem to think that they can experiment upon children as physiologists and bacteriologists practise upon guinea pigs, and that without any equivalent basis of scientific knowledge. The result upon the child is confused conceit rather than mental clarity, and a little information about everything rather than exact efficiency in any definite thing. There is lack of concentration and drill upon any one thing until it is mastered, and therefore there is little exultation over accomplishment, small inspiration to new undertakings, and a dearth of either information or power that is permanently retained. It wearies the teacher and mystifies the child; it confounds the father and mother and deprives the school of the intelligent cooperation of the home.

Even that is not all. We are more prodigal of the lives of children than is any other constitutional nation upon the globe. We let them commence school late and come irregularly and loiter along through a confused course at their pleasure or discomfiture, as you please. Between subordinating our elementary schools to the requirements for admission to a literary high school, and the indif-

ference of legislators and petty magistrates about making and enforcing attendance laws, we are doing a great wrong to millions of children, we show a larger percentage of illiteracy than other favored nations, and we withhold the support which the schools are bound to give to the strength and character of the Republic.

Everybody sees the results but not many appreciate the reason. The root of the trouble is not where the uninitiated are looking for it. It is not, for example, with what the editorial writers call the "fads and frills." Drawing, basketry, modeling, sloyd, joinery, cooking, and sewing, for an hour or two each week, impose no burden. They afford relaxation, open the way for healthful comradeship and rivalry, supply motive, and lay a little of the groundwork for happy lives, by looking toward both the manual and mental efficiency so sorely needed. But we do not lay the first courses in the building with sufficient exactness and strength to enable our young men and women to erect either successful professional or successful industrial lives upon them. Good housewifery and good craftsmanship are not forging ahead. The bake-shop is a menace to stomachs and to homes. The woman who can not bake a light loaf of bread, or broil a steak and keep the juices in it, or happily employ her odd moments with a needle, may be a very charming institution; she may keep us posted about the new novels and the opera; she may amply make up for shortcomings by teaching school; but, she is an inefficient home maker, and it is not given to many to make up for that. The lack of housekeepers is as serious as the dearth of mechanics, and whatever the schools have done to correct the trouble, in either case, has been but little and it has *not* been a waste of time. The only legitimate criticism upon it is that there has not been enough of it, nor enough definiteness about it, to make sure of results. If more of the time of the schools were given to these things, with a stern eye to efficiency; and if there were less waste of time in connection with books, we would soon see a new and a more golden epoch in American education and in American life.

The things that are weighing down the schools are the multiplicity of studies which are only informatory, the prolongation of branches so as to require many textbooks, and the prolixity of treatment and illustration which will accommodate psychological theory and sustain pedagogical methods which have some basis of reason but which have been most ingeniously overdone.

I have no right to say this without more definiteness, even though it tax your patience. There is a waste of time and productivity

in all of the grades of the elementary schools. If a school is to be graded, then a grade should mean something. A child is worse off in a graded school than in an ungraded one, if the work of a grade is not capable of some specific valuation, and if each added grade does not provide some added power. The first two grades run much to entertainment and amusement. The third and fourth grades repeat the *work* supposed to have been done in the first two. Too many unimportant and unrelated facts are taught. It is like the wearying orator who reels off stories only to amuse, seems incapable of choosing an incident to enforce a point, and makes no progress toward a logical conclusion. The early grades constitute the period of imitation, and the work should be mainly *drill* based on memory and imitation. It is not the period of much thinking; it requires such drill as will result in exact knowledge of the rudiments when the time for using them really comes. Thought should not be much expected in these grades. The reading should be for the quick recognition of the word and the proper expression of it, rather than to germinate thought. When thinking is possible and normal, the time to encourage it has arrived. Then it is done too slowly. The work of the first four grades is too much extended, and that of the last four is not commenced early enough.

Let us illustrate: The backbone of our elementary work should be the English language — not language lessons learned and recited, but a progressive knowledge of grammatical analysis, much reading for the pleasure there is in it, and a use of the language in accurate and forceful statement. If this is really the point, it will be seen how much of what we are now doing may be omitted. There is much in our elementary mathematics that is of little value as mental discipline and of little use in life. In the lower grades the pupils should be made "letter perfect" in the tables and the fundamental processes. This perfect knowledge will, a little later, master fractions, decimals, and percentage, which are the same things in different forms. The rest in the books is of little value except in particular employments which few of the pupils will ever enter. There is too much geography in present courses, and much is gone over again and again. Only the relations of the great natural and political divisions of land and water, the location of the great centers of population, with more of the details of one's own state, need find an early place in the schools. The rest is unremunerative to small children, and they will get it in a few minutes by and by, if it ever becomes necessary for them to know it. In physiology

we are trying much which only a physician can understand, and which there is no present call for the child to know, and we are doing it badly and using the time wastefully. We reach after too much mere information in the lower grades, and in the later ones we are not up with the normal powers of the healthy child. And the full and proper exercise of the intellectual as of the physical powers is the essential condition of mental health.

The larger part of this waste, as it seems to me, is due to two very plausible and very baneful doctrines which pretty nearly have taken possession of the schools in the last quarter-century. Their disciples have been sincere enough and I have nothing in the world against them except a radical difference of opinion. Sometimes their theories have been presented attractively enough to carry associations of teachers into pedagogical ecstasies and hysteria. Those theories have had enough learning and truth to make them dangerous, and not enough to make them potential. I refer to the unsubstantial and delusive theories about speculative psychology, and the cure for all educational ailments which is falsely called "culture."

I am far from saying that psychology, or deduction, or imagination, or sentiment, has no place in a system of education. Each has a large place where sense is free to ridicule its excesses and science may impose limitations upon its license. I am far from being indifferent to the forms and accomplishments of polite society: but mere manners may be only boorishness and brutality refined, or insipidity but little disguised. Culture worth seeking, in or out of the schools, must come from labor upon things worth doing, and from the influence of the power to do and the pleasure of real accomplishment upon the soul of the one who does. The external forms of culture do not make real men and women, but enough work, and true teachers, and a healthful and attractive environment are more than likely to start boys and girls on the road to culture worth the having.

There are people who worship theory as though it were greater than life, and culture as though it were something to be put on like a jacket instead of the refining of the soul through the labor and the experiences of life. Emotion, and ecstasy, and affectation, are made to do duty for sincerity and power, and for religion and patriotism too. These people ignore the culturing value of labor, and of deprivation, and of sorrow. They are flippant about the Bible without feeling its inspirations or studying its translations. They are not much stirred by the flag, for they know little of the heroism that has reddened so many stripes, and they feel little of the aspi-

ration that is emblazoned in every star. Mind you, it is not said that these people are the rich. Quite as often they are people who make "culture" do duty for riches. Frequently they are people who have gained wealth faster than they can assimilate it. Whoever they are, they should no longer be permitted to tear out the substantial underpinnings of the schools.

These things are said only in explanation of the difficulties and in hope of finding a remedy for the troubles of the elementary schools. Whatever the explanation, the difficulty is manifest and the need of remedy is imperative. We must know what children of school age there are in a state, and where they are when the schools are open. We must stand for simplifying the course and shortening the time of the elementary schools, and for making their teaching of more definite worth. We must try very hard to have the child able to do some definite thing, no matter at what age we lose him.

We must organize an entirely new system of general industrial and trades schools which will make it worth while for all children to remain in school; and which will provide for the children of the masses, and for the great manufacturing and constructive industries, something of an equivalent for what we are doing for the children of the more well-to-do and for the professional interests and the managing activities of the country.

Factory and Trades Schools

It is time to organize a wholly new order of schools as a part of the public school system. We may separate the new order into two general classes. One class may train all-round mechanics for work in factories, where workmen act in cooperation, where each is part of an organization, and where much machinery is used; and these may be called factory schools. The other class may train mechanics who work independently, mainly with their own tools, and without much machinery; and these may be called trades schools.

We say "a new order of schools" because the new schools ought to be sharply distinguished from any schools that are now known in America. They ought to be wholly apart from the manual training schools. They will have a distinct individuality and a definite object of their own. They are neither, primarily, to quicken mentality nor to develop culture: those things will come in the regular order. The "culturists" are not to appropriate these new schools. They are not to train mechanical or electrical engineers:

the literary and technical schools are doing that very amply. They are not even to develop foremen; leaders will develop themselves for they will forge ahead of their fellows by reason of their own ability, assiduity, and force. The new schools are to contain nothing which naturally leads away from the shop. *They are to train workmen to do better work that they may earn more bread and butter.*

A tentative plan would make these new schools more shoppish than schoolish; put them in plain but large buildings, sometimes using idle factories of which many cities have a supply; use books somewhat, but make reading subordinate to manual work; refuse to permit our charming friends, who write and print and sell books, to inflate these schools, as they have the elementary schools, to the bursting point; put them in charge of craftsmen who can teach, rather than of teachers who are primitive mechanics; keep them open day and evening; make the instruction largely individual; adjust them to the needs of those who must work a part of the time at least in order to earn a living; and make them for boys and girls and men and women, and of every kind and description which may be necessary to meet the demands of the local factories and trades.

These schools will have to be an integral part of the public school system, for the double reason that they can not be successful without articulating with that system and that they will not be accepted either by capital or organized labor without standing upon a legal footing which is independent of both and fair between them. It may as well be said at once that any school teaching a definite trade will fail without the sympathy of both the capital and the organized workmen engaged in that trade. They can not be expected to support it, if it can be used in favor of another interest and so arrayed against their own. Capital will take care of itself under economic laws that are well understood. If it can not venture with reasonable expectation of profit, it will retreat; but it will exist. Capital has a strong enough motive for activity in the hope of profits, but labor has a stronger one in the need of bread. In this country it is not in the nature of either to brook injustice, and the needs of each make it unnecessary that the other do so. In the last analysis each will have to square with the plan that stands fair, that *encourages* capital to provide labor for workmen by protecting all of the just rights of capital, and that *encourages* the man to make the most of himself by assuring all of his just rights in his individual industry and skill.

That is an American plan and it ought to prevail. It is the only one which holds out the equal chance to every one. Such a plan can not in the nature of things be left to private enterprise. It can not be dominated by any forces which are in the least exclusive. American workmen are not willing to depend upon philanthropy. They will not widely accept the training schools set up by the manufacturing corporations. They are entitled to the same, or equivalent, rights as those which are already granted to the professional and employing classes. They know that, and will exact what belongs to them. Whatever is done they want done so completely as to command the respect of the best skill. They will tolerate no false pretense about mechanical skill, but they will be glad to shorten the time in which their boys may become real journeymen. In any event, they know very well, at least their leaders do, that when these things are so they will have to accept them. All this can come in no other way than upon the basis of, and in association with, the public schools.

The new schools can not displace, nor half displace, the common, elementary school. They will have to follow and supplement it. The reason is both in educational necessity and in the likes and the needs of the people. But it is quite possible that the compulsory attendance age, in cities at least, may be so extended as to cover the time of these industrial schools. Easily so if the elementary course can be shortened or children can be brought to the end of it earlier than they are. The law should see that a child is either in school or at work up to his seventeenth or eighteenth year.

How far we can succeed in establishing these purely industrial schools is, of course, problematic. Cities and towns will have to be encouraged by liberal State support. No trades schools have ever been successful without government aid. The experiences of other lands — and there have been rich experiences in other lands — will have to become well known among our people. In any event, it is certain that the extent to which the movement takes hold upon our life seems to be filled with a significance to which no intelligent American can remain indifferent.

Re-forming the Public School System

It remains for me to suggest, as briefly as I may, the location and relations of these new schools in and to the public school system, and the extent of the re-forming which will be incident to their admission.

It is proposed to reduce the compulsory attendance age to seven years in cities and towns, and to take definite measures for a far more complete and regular attendance; to lengthen the term and lighten the work; to simplify the courses and to give them a more industrial and efficient trend through the simple forms of hand work, such as paper cutting and folding, molding in sand and clay, plain knife and needle work, and the like, which can be done in the regular schoolrooms from the very beginning of the primary grades; and to push children along so that they will at all times have work which appeals to their years, and will complete the present work up to the end of the sixth grade at an earlier age than now. If the present eight grades can be shortened by one or two grades and a year or two of time, so much the better.

At the end of the present sixth grade it is proposed to have the system begin to separate into three very distinct branches. The larger part of the work of the present seventh and eighth grades would be uniform, but some differentiation, looking to very complete separation, would begin with the present seventh grade.

The three distinct classes of schools to follow the elementary schools would be; *first*, the present high school system, which would be somewhat relieved because of the new arrangement; *second*, business schools looking to work in offices, stores, etc.; and *third*, factory and trades schools looking to the training of workmen.

With the work of the present seventh grade there might be commenced some study of modern foreign languages by pupils destined for the literary and classical high schools; some special commercial subjects by pupils destined for the advanced business schools; and some special training at benches with tools, and in the household and domestic arts, for those who are to stop with the elementary schools or are to go to the factory schools or trades schools.

At least half of the teachers in the seventh and eighth grades should be men; and these grades may well be housed in central and specially prepared rooms.

We might hope to economize the time and increase the efficiency and productivity through the grammar grades to such an extent that a part of the compulsory school life of the child would remain at the end of the eighth grade; and we might also hope that there would be schools beyond the eighth grade which would be able to so increase the earning power of the child, no matter what his life work should be, that it would be clearly to his interest to remain in school. Then, as he approaches what is now the seventh grade, he and his teachers and parents would begin to think of the work

he is ultimately to do, and by the time he is through the elementary course he would find abundant opportunity and have some enthusiasm for a school which may exactly qualify him for that work, no matter whether it is professional, or in business activities, or in purely industrial lines.

Conclusion

We can discuss the subject no longer tonight. The sure basis of a nation's strength is in industry as much as in intellect, and in skill as much as in resources. The assurance of a nation's greatness is in the equipoise of mental and manual activities. We do well to open treasure-houses of higher and liberal learning, but they will avail little if we permit inefficient primary schools and if we turn away from the labor of the hand. We do well to conserve material resources, but it will not count for much unless we conserve the time of boys and girls and enlarge the efficiency and versatility of the craftsmanship which must convert resources into merchantable goods. It is idle to pursue a course which is destructive of the equilibrium of the common life and ignores the decisive influence of work upon the worker. Heads and hands and hearts, acting together, are larger factors than wood and iron and water in the economic problems of the world, and they are infinitely larger factors in the moral, and constitutional, and international, and eternal problems of men and women.

We can not escape the fact that the elementary schools are wasting time, and that the lack of balance in the educational system is menacing the balance of the country. Children, schools, and country, are being ground out between fanciful and conflicting educational theories. The demand that there shall be less mystery and exploitation, less prolixity and parade, that the programs of the schools shall be more rational and that the work of the teachers shall fit children for definite duties with more exactness, is heard on every side.

It does not mean that we must give over the work which goes to literary accomplishment, or art sense, or refined manners, or professional equipment, or scientific learning of whatsoever kind. It does mean that the equilibrium between intellectuals and industrials is being lost and must be restored. It does mean that children are being misdirected into misfits and that it must cease. It means more concern for life, increased productivity in the elementary schools, and incidentally, more rational courses in the secondary schools.

It is not for a great national association of teachers to dodge or to deny a palpable difficulty in the schools. The fault is no more inside than outside of the schools. It is the product of our political freedom, of our quick temperament and universal ambitions, of our aptness in making and acting upon propositions, of our tendency to do everything at once, of our bad habit of not taking care, and of the toleration and good nature which allow people to try out at the common cost any philosophy that the brightest and wildest imaginations in the world may bring forth. In a way it is creditable to us. We would rather be all that we are than be without the open chance and without the common alertness. But it is for the National Education Association to recognize difficulties and meet them. We may not all see just how to do it tonight but we will find the way tomorrow. And no matter what we do, the glorious optimism of the nation will rise to greet the morning sun with an eye as clear and a soul as confident as ever.

THE SCHOOL NEEDS OF A CITY

ADDRESS BEFORE THE CURRENT TOPICS CLUB OF THE Y. M. C. A. OF
TROY, N. Y., APRIL 2, 1908

Mr Toastmaster and Gentlemen of the Current Topics Club:

The opportunity to discuss with you the needs of this city concerning schools, is one which I keenly appreciate. Troy is an energetic, thrifty, business city, and I am assured that your organization consists very largely of men who are active in its business affairs. Such men are much interested in the good repute and prosperity of their city; their influence upon its sentiment is very considerable; their views of public policies are, as a rule, very rational and sane. As their business is closely related to the prosperity and repute of the city, and as their methods must be determined by sound business principles, they have both the motive and the means for doing things, and preventing things, in ways that make for the common good. Troy has had many difficulties about its schools, and I have therefore accepted, with pleasure, your invitation to present my views concerning the proper organization and administration of the schools in such a city.

The Cause of Difficulties

I have said that you have had very considerable difficulties in connection with your schools. I doubt if any of you will be disposed to deny it. I have had cause enough to know it, and I am sure that you know that I know it. I do not mean to say that in the long run you have had more difficulties than other cities: you have had an epidemic of difficulties in the last year or two. It is to the credit of your city that your people have been indignant about it, and have shown determination and ability to remove the cause. The irritating cause of the trouble may be expressed in the word "politics." A system of public schools is vitally dependent upon immunity from all partizanship, which is well enough when kept within its legitimate bounds.

Common schools rest upon a basis of unalloyed patriotism. The intrusion of any special interest is resented by the common thought of the people, and is provided against by the laws as completely as laws can regulate the doings of people who are blinded by their

intensity of feeling, or who resort to mischievous and subtle methods for gaining their particular ends. Any intrusion of the partizanship which is expressed by the word "politics," into a system of common schools, is an unmitigated nuisance. Politics *has* burrowed its way into the school system of Troy. In saying that, I by no means attribute the responsibility to the managers of any one party. I have no doubt that there are artists on both sides of politics in Troy, who would use the schools to promote party ends, so long as it is possible for either one side or the other to do it. Certainly I do not mean to say that Troy is worse than many other cities: indeed, in some respects, I think it is better. It has had good schools in the past; and in the force and positiveness of the determination to have good schools in the future, which it has shown in the last year, it is to be commended above many other cities. ✓ It may just as well be understood, first as last, and here as elsewhere, that an efficient system of common schools must be very responsive and sensitive to a wholesome and informed popular sentiment which will brook no interference by special and selfish interests.

The Board of Education

The first need, the one that is fundamental to all the others, is a board of education consisting of sane and balanced members. The board stands for the people. It is not expected that it will consist of teachers or of others who are familiar with the history and philosophy of education, or who have had much intimate experience with the internal operations of the schools. It is not only unnecessary that the members of the board shall be experts in the administration of the schools, but, generally speaking, it is undesirable. It is necessary that they shall be honorable and intelligent citizens, who are able to understand and to express the better sentiment of the people concerning the schools. Public sentiment must have its opportunity. There is an all-important factor in school administration which is wholly apart from making courses of study and methods of teaching. The people are to be free to say what, in a general way, their schools shall do. They are to retain the power to locate and determine the character of buildings, to map out the roads that are to be pursued, and to control the quality of the instruction. The laws prescribe certain minimum requirements, and fix a few imperative regulations. Usage has gone further than law in settling the general procedure of the schools. Aside from assuring

reasonably efficient elementary schools in every community, both law and usage leave it to that community to do about what it will in its schools. This the community does through the common sentiment and through the board of education. If the board of education consists of men — or men and women — who are imbued with the American spirit and are bent upon giving the best chance to every child; who can keep in touch with the people while they inspire, draw out, and make the most of the better purposes that are to be found in all American cities; who will not believe that they know so very much more nor so very much less than other people do about what is good for the schools; and who, moreover, will lay hold of all available information, and have the courage to stand for what is right and what is good in the training of the young, there will not be very much trouble about the schools.

It would be idle to discuss here how a city is to get such a board. There is a rather common saying among men who are prominent in the educational work of the country, that whatever method of appointment is employed only proves that some other method would be better. Doubtless the method which obtains in Troy, namely, appointment by the mayor, is as good as any. Wherever public opinion is keen, sensitive and alert, a community will not long suffer itself to be misrepresented by a board of education which makes plunder out of securing supplies for the schools, and patronage out of the appointment of teachers. In such a community, where such a board of education has in some inscrutable way come into being, the people will find some plan for "cleaning house," and putting representatives of ordinary integrity and ordinary intelligence in control.

Experience has abundantly proved that a small board of education, with concentrated and centralized responsibility, works more satisfactorily than a large one in which it is difficult to locate meannesses. Experience has also amply demonstrated that a board in which all the members stand for the school interests of the entire city, and not for those of a ward or other subdivision of the city, is far more likely to deal justly with all sections, and to promote all the interests of all the people, than a board in which the members represent subdivisions of territory and population, and scheme to secure a special advantage to the special interests for which they stand.

In general, it may be said that a board which is small enough to sit around a council table and confer in moderate tones, is very

preferable to a board in which there is much display of oratory and much worthless but inevitable talk to the galleries. The city having a board that is small enough for real conference, modest enough to learn, honest enough to treat patrons and teachers with justice, and courageous enough to compel all selfish interests to keep their hands off the schools, is to be congratulated; and the city which is without such a board will do well to agitate and contend until it secures one.

Business Management

The board of education must, of course, be relied upon to manage the financial affairs of a city school system in ways which will command public confidence. This is essentially a business matter, and it ought not to be a difficult task for any man who is entitled to be considered for appointment to such a board. The ideal man for a board of education is one of sound business habits and considerable business experience, who is genuinely sympathetic with the popular interests and the work of the schools. Certainly with such men, there is very little difficulty about managing the business affairs of the school system. The books are to be always open, and whatever is done is to be without any element of secrecy about it. It may as well be said here as elsewhere that it is a vicious practice for the members of a board to divide matters between themselves so that one member shall have it in his power to determine what is to be done, when the law contemplates that all such determinations shall be reached in conference and by the board itself. Of course, it is well enough, and often necessary, for one member to see that a thing which has been determined upon, or a course which has been outlined, is actually carried out; but the discretion of one member of a board about what had better be done is never to be substituted for the discretion of the entire board, or of a clear majority of it.

A board of education is frequently called upon to determine the location of new school buildings. In rapidly growing cities this calls for the exercise of considerable foresight, which, it is needless to say, is not a very plentiful article. Yet, if the matter is discussed somewhat in the newspapers and among the people, and if there is a purpose to meet real needs, and not to favor a particular section or a man of influence, there will not be a great deal of difficulty about it. The architecture of new school buildings ought to have more care than is usually given it. It is a

great pity that the opportunity to erect a really artistic and attractive building is so frequently lost by reason of the disposition to favor local architects, who can not design an artistic structure and who have had little or no experience in making plans for school buildings. It is idle to suppose that an inexpensive schoolhouse must be an ugly looking one. Architectural effects are not dependent alone upon the size of the structure, and materials to be used, nor the amount of ornamentation. Any building in which the public has the sense of proprietorship—whether it is by the roadside or in a country village; whether it is a ward school in a city of a hundred thousand people; or whether it is the De Witt Clinton or the Erasmus Hall High School, costing millions, in the city of New York—ought to be erected upon plans which appeal to the pride of the people, and, consciously or unconsciously, promote the art taste of the multitude.

I am not standing for extravagance in schoolhouses or in their equipment. They should express something of the wealth, and a great deal of the intelligence, of the people whom they are to serve. While it is no economy to go without good school accommodations, and while it is a positive wrong to send children to school in a building that is unclean or badly lighted and ventilated, there is no strong reason why the schools should be maintained in palaces. Of course, if a city has wealth to spend upon palaces, it may as well put it into palaces for the schools, as for any other purpose. While the efficiency of the school is not dependent upon the cost of the building, a public schoolhouse ought to stand in about the same relation to a community that a residence bears to a good citizen. Boards of education sometimes overreach in the matter of school expenditures, and quite as often they do not go as far as the better sentiment of the city would sustain them in going. Timidity is a poor attribute for a board of education, but sound judgment, courage, and frankness, which produce buildings to be proud of, and give character, culture, and energy to the work of the schools, will find abundant support in American cities.

This is perhaps a good time and place to say that it ought to be realized more commonly than it is, that the school system of a city is a part of a state system of education, and is not responsible to the city government. Boards of education, in particular, ought to appreciate that important legal fact. It is true, that it is often provided by law that the members of a board of education shall be appointed by the mayor of the city. That is for convenience: it

does not make the board of education responsible to the mayor. It is true, that the law frequently provides that the school budget shall be passed upon by a city board, which determines the amount to be raised for each public purpose within the city; but this again is for convenience. Perhaps the advantage of collecting all taxes through the same machinery, and the desirability of avoiding conflicts over the sums to be raised for school and other purposes, are sufficient justification for this arrangement; but there is nothing in or about it which may legitimately give any officer of the city government either the legal or the moral right to interfere with the appointment of teachers, to fix the salaries for individual positions in the schools, or to do anything else which has a bearing upon their organization or administration. All that is, by the law of the state, committed to the state school authorities, and to the local board of education.

The Superintendent of Instruction

I have no doubt that the appointment of the superintendent of instruction, or superintendent of schools as he is commonly called, is the most far-reaching duty which the board of education ever has to perform. The functions of the office call for a man who is entitled to the community's confidence and respect. He is bound to be a manly man, whom the teachers, and, particularly, the children in the schools, may justly admire. He ought to be a man whose very carriage, and whose doings and sayings, will stir the teaching body to its very best, and will be an inspiration to the children in long after years. An effeminate man may do many things well enough, but he can not fill the position of superintendent of schools. The superintendent is bound to be a scholar who has not stopped studying. He must be familiar with educational history and theory, and yet he must not let these things have a complete monopoly of his thought and his work, because he must enter into all of the real interests, and many of the activities, of the city, to the end that he may best enable the schools to serve the purposes for which they are maintained. He must be filled with the kindness which will be sensitive to the right of every parent to the best possible training for his children, and jealous of the utmost opportunity for every child. He must have a sense of justice which will require him to hear all sides; a measure of patience which is not easily exhausted; a power of reasoning which will

enable him to come rather quickly to conclusions that will stand, and a decisiveness which will command confidence because of its logical basis and its definite and positive attitudes. He must be a man who can lead, and organize, and administer. He must be able to see what will work, and, quite as much, he must be able to see what will *not* work. There must be order, and system, and result, about his doings. He must see the defects in the schools, and when he does, he need not be afraid to speak of them; but he must have remedies for defects, and definite ways for resisting and curing the evils which incessantly creep in at all of the open doors of every large system or organization. Possibly above all else, he must be a man who can work harmoniously with other people, seeing their point of view and giving the fullest opportunity for the expression of their opinions, up to the time when policies and courses are decided upon, and then commanding the good will and the support of all in the onset which accomplishes things.

The men who are qualified for this position are scarce. This is particularly true when the position is in a city of 50,000 inhabitants or more. Still, there are such men and they may be found. Certainly they may be found by a board of education which will treat them as they are entitled to be treated, and pay them as they are entitled to be compensated. A truly efficient city superintendent of schools is an economical investment, no matter how much his salary; and a weak one is costly, no matter how low his salary may be.

It makes little difference whether, at the time of his appointment, he lives in the city, or in some other city in the state, or even in some other state. Of course, if there is a really qualified superintendent developed in a city school system, there is a large element of justice in giving him the place, not only because he has earned it, but because of the inspiration which his appointment must give to the ambitious and aggressive teachers who have worked long in the system. There is a certain advantage, too, in the appointment of one who is already familiar with the city — its ideas and disposition — as there is also an advantage in a new man not being called upon to learn the special laws and discover the prevalent feelings of a state which is new to him. But these things should not have too much weight: a resourceful and efficient man can adapt himself to new conditions. I am sorry to say that it often happens that a city which thinks it has an excellent school system, has in fact, a very poor one. Sometimes superintendents and teachers who have

practically gone to seed, have told the people so often and so vehemently that they have the best schools in the country, that they have really come to believe it; when what they need, above all else, is a new superintendent who knows what really good school work is. The opportunity to appoint a superintendent of schools does not come every day, and when it does come the board of education ought to look the broad field over, and, finding the man who is adapted to the position, pay him whatever is necessary to command his services.

Of course, it must be borne in mind that a man who is really capable of serving a community as superintendent of its schools, will not tolerate ill treatment by the board of education. He is likely to be obliged to tolerate a great deal from other people, but the essentials of his office are such that he can hardly hope to succeed in his work without the support of the board of education. Moreover, he must be given freedom in the discharge of his duties. He is an expert in organizing schools, in laying out courses of study, in judging of teaching, and in adapting teachers to particular places. This is an expert and professional service, which nobody expects the members of the board to render. If they are to assume that they know more about the particular things for which a superintendent is employed, than the superintendent himself does, they might as well dispense with the services of a superintendent and manage the whole thing themselves. Modern schools are vitally dependent upon the expertness of the supervision, and this, in turn, is dependent upon a real expert who has freedom of action. No real expert will permit himself to be defeated and humiliated about matters which are within his professional knowledge and experience, and which are committed to his care, by men who have the mere physical or political power, and not the special knowledge nor the moral right, to do so. The weakest sort of a modern school system that I know of, is one in which a weak superintendent becomes a mere figurehead, while laymen appoint favorites to teach the schools, and join with the superintendent in frequently assuring the people that they are blessed with the best school system in the world.

Of course, I know that there are men who claim to be superintendents of schools, without any reason. Certainly I am aware that there are men who have in some way got into the position of superintendent, who can not safely be trusted with the free exercise of a superintendent's normal powers and functions. Wherever

this is true there is but one thing to do, and that is, to have a change. I know many cases where a superintendent who never had much real aggressiveness, or who has outlived such as he may have had, has been in one place so long that the children who once looked up to him from their desks with the feeling that he was very great, have grown to manhood and womanhood, and give him their best support because of their personal feelings towards him, notwithstanding the fact that what their schools most need now is a new superintendent.

I sum this phase of the subject up in a few words by saying that it is the business of a board of education to make sure that it has an energetic, just, and up-to-date superintendent of schools, and then to support him in all that relates to the teachers and the teaching. Of course, the best results will not be secured unless the board and the superintendent are glad to confer, and enjoy working together. No man is so great as to be above being called upon for the reasons which sustain what he proposes and what he does. That is what decent men expect, and what strong men enjoy. But, in the last analysis, what the superintendent of instruction proposes concerning the teachers and the teaching must be upheld in all essential particulars, or the time has come for a radical change in the composition of the board of education, or for bringing in a new superintendent whose propositions and ways will command confidence and support.

The Teaching Service

The one prime object in a large school system, the object to which everything else must bend and with which nothing must be allowed to interfere, is the development of a teaching service of reasonably uniform excellence. The point is not to get a few good teachers, but to avoid having any poor teachers. We are bound to preserve all of the rights of parents, and to promote all of the interests of children. The forces that are against us are many, and they are strong; but there is no way of developing a corps of teachers which will meet all of the demands, save by uniform procedure persistently followed for a long time.

Teachers must, of course, be proficient in subject-matter. They must know a great deal more than the mere work which they are to teach. Primary teachers should have had, at least, the advantage of a high school training; it is not unreasonable to expect that some of them shall have had the advantage of college courses.

High school teachers should be college graduates. I can conceive of circumstances which would justify the appointment of a primary teacher who had not graduated from the high school, and of a high school teacher who had not graduated from college, but in an overwhelming number of cases it would not be so. There is no excuse now for a narrow education on the part of a teacher, because the opportunities for liberal learning are all about us, and one who is likely to make a fair teacher will lay hold upon some of these opportunities.

Teachers have to be trained for their work just as any other professional people have to be trained for the work which they are to undertake. One must know the history and the philosophy of education; must know what other states and other countries are doing for and in their schools; must know the relations which one class, grade, or kind of school sustains to the other branches of the school system; and must have some special knowledge of ways for quickening the minds of children so that they will have some interest in doing the work which strengthens the mind and sharpens the appetite for knowing things. All this can not be trained into a person who is altogether without aptitude and enthusiasm for teaching; but one who has predisposition for it may be greatly aided by normal and training schools and classes.

I have grown much in favor, of late years, of city training schools, because experience has shown me that they are likely to be more efficient than schools located outside of the city in developing teachers suited to the special needs of a particular city. Of course, I have in mind cities of considerable size, where many new teachers are needed every year, and where a training school must have a considerable number of students in order to meet the annual demands of the city schools for teachers. This is certainly so where a city has a highly efficient superintendent, who knows what the schools need, who has distinct ideas about what ought to be done to meet those needs, and who is glad to have the ordinary schools and the training school, the teachers and those who are candidates for teachers, work together to accomplish definite ends.

Even after this, the fact remains that some teachers are thoroughly successful in some places, and as thoroughly unsuccessful in other places. Therefore, not only general knowledge and professional training, but adaptation to particular pupils and particular kinds of work, must be considered. Often a teacher does not know what she would most like to do, or what she can do best, until after

she has tried. A failure in one place is not always conclusive evidence of general failure. The superintendent and the teacher must work it out together. If the superintendent can help the teacher, he is bound to do it. If she will not be helped, or can not be helped, she must be required to make way for one who can fill the place.

All this points to the importance of a teaching spirit, a spirit that likes children and enjoys teaching, that is anxious to be proficient, that can appeal to intelligent parents, that can work harmoniously with other teachers, and can submit to the régime which is vital to the proficiency of all large organizations.

Practically all of this must be left to the superintendent of schools. If a city has not a superintendent to whom it may be safely and wisely left, it needs a new one. If it has one to whom it may well be left, the board of education is derelict if it does not leave it to him.

The statutes of this State protect the tenure of teachers in the cities of the first and second class. In time the same protection will doubtless be extended to cities of the third class. This is desirable, not only because of the rights of the teachers, but also because of the aid which it gives to the development and efficiency of the entire teaching force. These statutes have sometimes been misunderstood by boards of education, and sometimes by teachers. It is not their purpose to protect an inefficient teacher. Their purpose is to protect reasonably efficient teachers against malevolent influences from the outside, and against hasty and inconsiderate, or even malicious, action on the part of the board of education. A teacher's entire capital is often summed up in her reputation as a teacher. It may be easily and quickly injured. That is not to be done lightly. An act concerning a teacher, which would be proper at one time, might be improper at another time. By common usage and by manifest right, a teacher who enters upon a year of teaching should be allowed to go on to its conclusion, unless some special and strong reason comes in to make an immediate change necessary in the interest of the school. Where it does, there is no injustice to the teacher, because parents are entitled to have their children taught, and no individual or minor interest may be allowed to overthrow the conclusive right of the parent of the child.

All these things, and perhaps many more, are to be considered by an honest board of education, whose main business is to develop in the schools under its charge a company of men and women who

can work peacefully and enthusiastically together in training the children as they need, and in quickening the intellectual activities of all the people.

What is to be Done in the Schools?

Up to this time I have been speaking, in the main, about the organization and administration of the schools. I have dwelt upon the character and qualities that must be found in the officers and teachers. Now, what is this all for? It certainly is not to provide work for people. The point of it all is to give every American child the utmost opportunity guaranteed to him by our political system. Indeed, I might properly go further, and say that it is not only to give to every child his best chance, but it is to make sure that he has the benefit of it, whether he or his parents are eager for it or not.

To this end it is vital that every child in the city shall have the elements of an education; at least, he must be able to read understandingly, to write legibly, and to use figures to the extent of making ordinary computations and preventing others from overreaching him. This is his right, whether or not his parents are interested in his having it. It is a right which must be enforced and made good to him, not only in his own interest, but in the interest of the city and of the nation. This is by no means the sum of his personal rights, nor the measure of the public concern about him. He must be trained in morals and in manners, he must be made obedient to authority, and made to recognize the rights of others. Having to live in our modern complex civilization, he must be trained in the things which will enable him to hold his own in that civilization, and even to make some contributions to it, to the end that he may not be a load upon it, but may give it strength and make it a support and an inspiration to others now living, and still others who are to follow after. Things must be done to draw out the better side of his nature, to culture his spirit, and to open to him all of the possibilities into which a harmoniously developed human character may enter and make the most of himself.

This is not all. Since we have gone so far in this country to urge our children to be ambitious, and to seek the highest places in our professional and political life; since we have so commonly assumed that their best opportunity is in a purely intellectual development,

as distinguished from mechanical or industrial proficiency; since we have gone so far in encouraging them to enter the high school and go to college — which lead almost conclusively to professional careers; and, since we have provided the instrumentalities for training them for purely intellectual vocations, we must, as it seems to me, in order to be just to all, and in order to restore the industrial equilibrium of the country, take some decisive steps to dignify the manual industries, to urge more children to engage in industrial vocations, and to provide the instrumentalities which will enable them to acquire proficiency in industrial life and fit them for particular vocations therein.

From this it does not necessarily follow that we have pursued a mistaken policy in doing what we have done to develop the literary schools so strongly. They were much needed, and it is quite possible that they would never have been so strongly developed, if they had not been developed first. They are the natural product of the outlook and genius of the country, the inevitable outgrowth of our national temperament and the genius which has resulted from the mingling of races and the building of national institutions; but we can hardly fail to see — indeed, the manifest break in the equilibrium between intellectual and manual vocations is compelling us to see — that we need a new class of schools which will make a special point of training our youth to manual industry, and of fitting them for particular trades. If we are to provide special training for those who are to follow intellectual pursuits, we are also bound to do it for those who are to follow manual pursuits. We must do less than we have been doing, or we must do more. There is no danger of our doing less.

Nor does all this imply any criticism whatever of the literary high schools, colleges, universities, and professional schools. The high school is in a special sense an American creation. In other national systems of education, there is hardly any class of schools to compare with it. It is the bridge which carries the children of the masses from the common elementary school over into the field where endless opportunities abound and where liberal learning flourishes. It is properly classified with American common schools, and everywhere in this country it has now become a part of the common school system. Indeed, everywhere in the country, save in the North Atlantic States, colleges and universities have become a part of the common school system. There is reason enough to believe that this will yet be the case in the old-time Middle and

New England States. It certainly will be so unless the colleges and universities already established keep so close to the ground and so near to the people as to make it unnecessary. However that may be, there can be no question about the fact that high schools, colleges, and universities are vital to the best efficiency of the elementary schools. Schools of every grade are quickened and inspired by the schools above, and an American city would make a deplorable mistake if it were to begin to think that the only schools which really deserve public encouragement and support, are those which teach the elementary branches. In one way or another, upon one plan or another, every intelligent community will do whatever it may do to make sure that it has up-to-date elementary schools and that all of its children attend such schools — either public or private; and also that the widest opportunities for general culture and for liberal learning are held out to all those who can be induced to lay hold upon them.

Conclusion

We have now considered, in a very general way, the essential factors of a school system in a city of some size. As my mind goes over the whole subject and I recur to what I have said, I am led to fear that you may think I have paid too much attention to the technical or professional side of the large problem. It is true that that side is of first and vital importance. It must have the largest attention and the freest opportunity. It must have this from the board of education, which stands for the intelligence, the generosity, and the civic pride of the city. I am very far from being disposed to underestimate the importance of the popular element in the upbuilding of a system of schools. A superintendent and teachers can accomplish little without rational and generous public support. Teachers, without the help of the public, would probably make as bad a fist of it as the public would make without the help of teachers. A system of schools in this country is bound not only to give every child his chance, but it is also to be shaped with some reference to the local situation and the particular interests of a community. The public, through the board of education, is derelict if it does not see to it that all this is done; the board of education is derelict if it does not freely take the initiative and exercise such decisive control as is necessary to keep the schools in line with the popular trend and up to the maximum of popular expectations. To this end it is bound to demand whatever amount

of money may be necessary to support the schools; to provide buildings which comport with the wealth and culture of the city; and to install libraries, scientific apparatus, furnishings, and all appliances which are needed by the teachers and which enlarge the self-respect and incite the ambition of the pupils and lead every sane citizen to feel proud of the fact that he has some sense of proprietorship in such splendid institutions. All this can result from nothing but generous and sincere cooperation between good citizens and good teachers. Where either of these factors is wanting, there can hardly be an efficient system of schools, and where both are present and are working in cooperation, there can not fail to be an admirable school system.

SUGGESTIONS TO THE STAFF OF THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

BY THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

These notes were the basis of a talk to the Assistant Commissioners of Education and the Directors and Chiefs of divisions on the 23d of September 1908.

1 System

Daily routine must be maintained. All employees must render seven hours of service daily. They must be ready to begin work at 9 o'clock, and not take more than an hour for lunch. This may be relaxed somewhat as to officers who do not limit their service to seven hours but give all their time to the service, without reference to the clock — but the proceedings of every day must be characterized by system, order and regularity.

2 Visiting

The visiting habit among clerks must be sharply repressed. There is too much of it in the corridors, as well as in workrooms. An efficient employee will find plenty to do. He will be happier for doing it. If there is time for idleness, there are too many employees. The one who keeps busy and accomplishes things should have preference when there is opportunity for promotion.

3 Going to the Legislature

Employees should not frequent, in office hours, the Senate or Assembly. It reflects upon the Department. They are never to go in groups or companies.

4 Gossip

Caution employees about loose talk in public places, such, for example, as the street cars. False and vicious stories start in this way. Caution all about talking among themselves, or with outside people, about Department matters of which they are not fully informed.

5 Relations of employees

Encourage self-respect and independence among employees. Let each attend to his own tasks and not interfere in the business of others. Discourage the borrowing or loaning of money between

one another. Let it be known that good standing in the Department requires that all ordinary living expenses be promptly met.

6 Concessions

Concessions to employees, such as absence, should be made very conservatively, only for substantial reasons, and to those who are diligent, proficient, and right-spirited in their work.

7 Transfers

We lose many employees by transfer to other Departments. We do not object to this; indeed, we are proud of it, if it is upon the initiative of the other Department, and not upon that of the employee. Any wire-pulling on the part of the employee to effect a transfer is censurable and will be sufficient ground for refusing it. But when it is asked by the other Department because of the worth of the employee, and when it promises to be of permanent advantage to the employee, it will be cheerfully acceded to, even though it be to the disadvantage of the Education Department. When this Department desires to transfer an employee from another Department to this one I will go to the head of the other Department and ask him about it, and when another Department wants to take one of our employees it is but proper that the head of that Department should communicate with me about the matter.

8 Discipline

If an employee disregards reasonable requirements, recommend dismissal.

9 Relations of officers

Assistant Commissioners are to handle the Department business upon the field, i. e. throughout the State. The "divisions" are to handle the business within the Department. An Assistant Commissioner is to call upon the Chief of a division for any service which he needs. He is not to give directions. If his call is not resultful when he thinks it should be, he is to report the matter to the Commissioner of Education. The Commissioner of Education, through the Chief of the Administration Division, is responsible for the efficiency and the integrity of the organization in each division. On the other hand, Chiefs of divisions will carefully refrain from invading that discretion in the handling of business which is vested essentially in the Assistant Commissioners. The divisions carry out

plans that are well settled. The Assistant Commissioners exercise discretion upon current questions. The Chief of a division should be extremely careful about any act, such, for example, as the writing of a letter, which is outside of well established routine, or which in any way goes beyond the specific thing which it is committed to him to do.

10 Appointments

The law gives to the heads of divisions the initiative concerning appointments. This is as I wish it, and I expect to observe the spirit, as well as the letter, of the arrangement. I am always willing to confer about an appointment or promotion. I do not exact conference—it will ordinarily be found best. I shall always maintain entire freedom about approvals. Not only the letter, but the spirit, of the civil service laws must be observed. There must be no maneuvering. If the civil service laws produce unfortunate results in any particular case, bring the matter to attention, and if need be we will go to the Civil Service Commission about it. In general, those laws are efficacious, and we must not only observe, but sustain, them. Do whatever may be done to increase the efficiency of employees under your supervision. If they are inefficient, try to change things about so as to help them. If they can not be helped, create vacancies and try other people.

11 Promotions

There are constant changes going on in the Department by reason of advancements to fill vacancies. Give preference to the most deserving. It is not always necessary to make a promotion as soon as a vacancy occurs; it is often well to let employees work for it. It is not always necessary to pay the maximum salary; it is often well to let one prove that he deserves it. There are some of you who study ways for increasing the salaries of employees, more than you do ways for increasing their usefulness and efficiency. The temptation to do this is recognized. Be upon your guard about it.

12 Answering letters

We speak often about promptness in answering letters, and yet, every few days a case comes to my attention where a letter has been neglected. Some answer should be made to a letter the day it is received. Certainly it should never go beyond the second day. If you can not give a complete answer at once, write and say as much as that, and indicate when you will do it. If you are away, your

stenographer should attend to it. If the correspondence is voluminous and delay is unavoidable, have a form for use in acknowledging receipt of letters. The credit of the Department is staked upon promptness in correspondence. It is a vital matter and there will be no compromising about it.

13 System concerning letters

The Department is now so well organized that there should be no difficulty in knowing where letters belong. If a letter gets into the wrong hands, it should be sent to the proper officer at once. Two officers should not be corresponding with the same person on the same subject. This may be avoided if one will make sure of his own responsibility and attend to his own business.

14 Money in letters

All letters containing money are supposed to be opened by the mailing clerks, who are under bonds. If by accident a letter containing money is opened by you, you should indorse the amount upon the letter at once, and send it without delay to the Cashier.

15 Avoid extravagance

Our postage, and express, and printing bills are necessarily large. Do not multiply sendings unnecessarily, and do not advise printing for the sake of printing. We do not have to make a show of doing things. Our business will grow in spite of us. We are to let it grow normally, but we are to avoid inflating it abnormally; and certainly we are to avoid any unnecessary expense.

16 Stenographers

The stenographers often need more direction than they have. They are to be made responsible for good order in the office, and for the systematic handling of business. Of course, the unsystematic and disorderly habits of an Assistant Commissioner or the Director or the Chief of a division, may make it next to impossible for a stenographer to do her work and his work systematically, but it is to be hoped that where this is the case, stenographers will be energetic and patient in training their Chiefs in habits of order and system. It is well not to have too many papers upon the desk at once. Indeed, the ideal way is to maintain perfect files, and have but one subject upon the table at a time. Whether the head of the office is orderly or not, however, the stenographer is bound to be:

that is an essential part of the stenographer's training. In the absence of the head of the office, the stenographer must do whatever she can to meet the wishes of the correspondents, and she must certainly see to it that nothing lies upon the table, without attention, long enough to bring reproach upon the service.

17 Form

All Department documents and letters should be in excellent form. I assume, of course, that good literary style and correctness in orthography and punctuation never will be lacking. I mean more than this; namely, that letters and papers must be in good style, in good physical form and marked by absolute neatness.

18 Signatures

Something has been said heretofore about signatures. There must be responsibility about the matter. When the signature of an officer vitalizes a paper, no one else should assume to sign it. A rubber stamp does not make a real signature. No one should sign any other name than his own without at the same time adding something which clearly signifies that it is not an original signature. When the validity of a paper depends upon the signature, it should never be signed before the blanks are all filled and it is in all respects complete.

19 Traveling

Aside from those officers of the Department whose particular business it is to travel, there should not be a great deal of it. Even such officers may waste time in traveling. It very commonly happens that it is better to send for local school officials to come here, than it is to go to see them. There is a serious break in handling the business of the Department when officers are away. They should not be away unless it is certain that the service will gain more by their going, than by their staying. When one travels on our business he should live comfortably, without ostentation, entering all expenses in his notebook and making a bill with such detail and in such form that it explains and justifies itself.

Whenever any officer of the Department is upon the roads he must remember that he is the representative of New York. When he makes an address or reads a paper, he should prepare for it as completely as he may, and present it just as well as is possible.

20 Hesitation and haste

Do not hesitate long about deciding and acting. You are likely to be as well able to do the thing rightly today as tomorrow. Problems accumulate with surprising rapidity. Do not fear mistakes; correct them openly as soon as discovered. Yet take the time that each duty requires. Do not let one duty jostle another. Do one thing at a time. It is remarkable how much more may be done in a given time if one thing is taken up at a time, attended to resolutely, and not done too hastily. It is quite as remarkable how little is accomplished, and how much demoralization results from hesitation and apprehension, or from impulsiveness and undue hurrying.

21 Helpfulness

Never let a visitor go away from the Department with ground for feeling that he has not been well treated. Advance to him and render him every possible service. Outside, as well as inside, of the Department, try to extend and uplift the educational service of the State, and be of every possible assistance to every one who may be assisted, whether he asks your help or not.

22 Training employees

We owe it to those who are under our direction that we direct and train them. They should never fail, or partially fail, for lack of firmness and steadiness in holding them to their responsibilities. Get them together and tell them what in general is wanted. Do not let them get into trouble because they are not told. If the fault is personal and specific, try to correct it by personal and direct, though kind and genuine, words. Cultivate kindness but avoid insipidity. Commend when you may, but do not do and say the pleasant things alone, when there are unpleasant duties which the good of an individual and the efficiency of the service require us to perform.

23 Freedom and independence of action

The theory of the departmental organization is that there is some one below the Commissioner of Education who will take care of all ordinary Department business which the law permits another to do. In doing this, act freely and independently. Do not trouble me with routine matters. Hold down your own job and fill your own place. Go ahead and reach out, if you can do it without getting in a mess. Spare me from annoyances as much as you can. When there is

something of real import which is not amply provided for, come to me without hesitation. I will give every help to you in my power, but I have many things, and very important things, that I want to do, and my doing of them depends upon your successful handling of all the ordinary business of the Department.

24 Conferences

Whenever I am not occupied I am glad to see any one in the Department for a word of greeting. When one wishes to confer with me about a matter of business it is necessary that he make the fact known to my Secretary to the end that an appointment may be arranged. It is idle for one to come to me about matters that another is charged with the duty of attending to and can attend to better than I. But when it is a matter that I should attend to I want to attend to it, and at a convenient time, so that it may be completely gone over. If it is of importance it will be better if I am advised of the nature of it in advance so that I may get it in mind and be as well prepared for the conference as may be.

25 Acknowledgments

If any one has imagined that I have been disposed to complain, he is mistaken. I am trying only to enlarge the pleasure and increase the usefulness of men and women who, in nearly every case, are ideally fitted for the work they are doing. I have never known an organization embracing three hundred people to operate, on the whole, more smoothly, or to be more capable and efficient. I am personally under endless obligations to you and to many others in the Department, and I want you to know that I keenly appreciate my obligations, and the obligations of the State, to you. But the highest measure of efficiency, and therefore of pleasure, in work, must always come from being busy, from being interested and enthusiastic, from accomplishing things, and from occasional reminders about the evils that menace a large organization and interfere with large undertakings.

26 Opportunities

We have a more comprehensive State educational organization than we ever had in this State before. There is nothing to compare with it in any other state. We have the opportunities to help numberless people, to raise the intellectual plane of the State, and so to distinguish the State in the eyes of the country. One is unworthy who would not make the most of such opportunities.

AGRICULTURE AND ITS EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

ADDRESS BEFORE THE JOINT MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATED ACADEMIC PRINCIPALS AND THE STATE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION, AT SYRACUSE, N. Y., DECEMBER 29, 1908

We are trying very hard in New York to bring the work of our schools to the support of our industries. A year ago when I discussed the relations of public schools to the mechanical industries, I observed that the reasoning would be different as to the agricultural industries because the situations are unlike, and that I would take up that theme at some future time. I turn to it now.

Differing Situations

The success of the farmer depends upon balanced character, love of the earth and of life in the open, knowledge of his farm and the ability to make some scientific applications, practical experience, a grasp of market conditions, sound relations with railroads, aggressiveness in planning, and good business methods, more than upon expertness in craftsmanship. The farmer is his own capitalist. In New York we had 226,000 farms in 1900. They averaged almost exactly one hundred acres to the farm. Quite 200,000 of them were operated wholly or in part by the owners. There was little room for capital to dictate. Hardly any other man has the earning capacity of so much property dependent upon his personal attributes as the farmer. The mechanic's equipment is in his skill of hand, and in his not expensive tools if he works by himself, or in a plant owned by others if he works in a factory. In either case he may move readily. The farmer's equipment is in his farm and in his trained and dependable judgment. He is very much a fixture wherever he is.

In the mechanical industries men live and think and plan and work collectively. They go out much of nights; they associate in organizations easily. In the agricultural industries men live and work very individually. They come to conclusions and carry out plans by themselves. In the cities, centralized capital on the one hand, and the leaders of labor organizations on the other, struggle with each other, to the frequent disadvantage of both. There much depends upon others. The farmer controls a considerable property, and the responsibility of prosperity or penury is very largely upon

himself. With both the farmer and the mechanic the personality is of overwhelming importance, but the conditions give the individuality of the farmer larger opportunities and make his success or failure more notable. Essentially, the farmer lives at home. The family life is by itself. The work is at home. The family all have part in it. There is less mingling with fellow craftsmen and with the men and women of other crafts. Trades unionism is absent. The blacklist and the boycott are almost unknown. The farmer is both a capitalist and a laborer. If there are combinations to control the prices of labor, they will not hold together; and if there are combinations to control the prices of products, they are made by manipulators who get the advantages. It all makes so distinct a manner of life that it must create instrumentalities and policies of its own.

We live in an industrial democracy. We are to work out our political freedom and our political theories in our politics, our religion, our education, and our industries. People are to do what they can for themselves. What can be done only in combination and through the use of common power may be done in that way so long as the fundamental equality of right is preserved. With this simple limitation, the state must aid all of its industries. And the manner of its aid must be specific, and the measure of it must regard the significance of the industry.

New York Agricultural Conditions

In days when the term "agriculture" embraced everything pertaining to the farm; when all there was of agriculture was "practical"; when we were almost wholly an agricultural people; when there were no glittering and gilded cities to allure the youth, and no railroads to carry them there; when our tillable lands were as potential as any which had been broken; when the farm raised all that it needed, gloried in its independence, and was the attractive abiding place of its youth; and when a simple school in cooperation with a simple and yet noble civilization sufficed to meet the essential needs of a virile people, New York was the first agricultural state of the Union. All that is much changed. You will not ask me to weary you with the details, available to all, which would prove an obvious fact. Taking our wheat, corn, oats, barley, rye, and buckwheat together, we have less in acreage and are producing less in quantity than forty years ago. The total value and the average value of lands, buildings, implements, machinery and live stock are less than thirty

years ago. We have come to be the first manufacturing state in the Union. Our agriculture has not advanced with our manufactures. In the cereals other states, for sufficient reasons, have forged ahead of us, and it seems to me that we have not recouped where we might.

The situation, in general, doubtless is that agriculturally we are worse off than thirty or more years ago, and a little better off than ten or fifteen years ago. Relatively we have lost much ground in many lines, and gained ground in a few. The responsibility for some of the losses is outside of ourselves. But, while we could not avoid some losses, we have developed new situations and new demands out of which we might have made our losses more than good. We have started towards doing it, but we have not done it. It is not enough to give thanks that we are not worse off than we are. We must lay hold of the forces that will make us better off than we are, and perhaps better off than we ever were. Those forces lie in scientific knowledge and in combined action, not combined action which merely complains and tries to make other people pay for our losses, but combined action which will do things that we can not either of us do alone, and which will make it easier for the man who has juice and generosity and force in him to prosper above other men; and which, on the whole, will enable New York agriculture to come to its own again. Admittedly, there are some conditions that are against it, but there are more new conditions that are in favor of it. If we can get the sentiment of the State in the way of reasoning that the government of New York should do as much for agriculture as for any other interest, or even a little more, and if we will lay hold of accumulated knowledge and apply it, and if we will organize a system of education which will support it, the somewhat heavy task may in time be accomplished.

Our Natural Advantages

There are natural advantages in our favor of which we are either unmindful or to which we give no fair value. Take for example the hills, the woods, the rocks, and the streams, the materials for building and for roads; the topographical, climatic, esthetic, healthful, and moral factors connected with them. I have lived for ten years in the Middle West upon a prairie where one can see the headlight of a locomotive for twenty-five miles. The soil is deep and black, without a stone in it. The people generally

abhor hills as nature does a vacuum. If some freak of nature has formed a knoll, they call it a hill and try to plane it off. I have seen a fine row of maples half a mile long cut down because they lessened the number of rows of corn, and a man of wealth thought he could not afford it. The roads are often impassable, and the cost of hard roads almost prohibitive. Farmers live in rubber boots for months together. The motive for moving to town is much greater there than here, and when a farmer lives in town there is trouble at both ends of his route: at one end the tenant lets the farm look like Hardscrabble's shanty, and at the other the farmer wants to keep a horse, and cow, and pig, and chickens, to the annoyance of his neighbors, and does what he can to avoid the cost of walks and pavements and sewers and electric lights. It is all natural enough, and only proves that the farmer is likely to be happier, and other people happier too, when he makes his farm an attractive and productive place and lives upon it. During my residence in Illinois, the farm lands in all the region advanced in price from about \$60 to about \$200 per acre. The regular crops of corn and oats make very sure returns of eight or ten per cent upon the latter valuation. The farmers are rational, and intense about making money, and all have bank accounts. But you do not have to get as much income out of land that you can buy for \$25 per acre, as out of land that is worth \$200 per acre, in order to make it pay; and the farm-houses and their conveniences and connections are no better there than here. In New York, above almost any other state in the Union, we have the hills and lowlands, the woods and streams, the diversity of soil, and the stimulation of climate, which may easily make rural life the finest and the noblest in all the world. If we can adjust the best kind of education to it all, the great leader of the states will have no difficulty in indefinitely maintaining her supremacy.

We have eighteen hundred miles of state roads. Put end to end they would reach from New York to Buffalo four times over. Over eight hundred miles were finished during the past year. There are five hundred other miles of road under contract, and still another thousand miles awaiting contract. We have expended less than a quarter of the \$150,000,000 we have agreed to expend. With the good roads, and the telephones, and the trolleys, and the daily free deliveries of mails in all sections, the rural difficulties ought to measurably disappear.

Rural Life Gaining in Attractiveness

Of course, there have been discouragements. It takes brawn, and brains, and confidence, and contentment, to till our New York farms. So does real success in all places and in all work. The weaklings have to fall down, wherever they are. The cities have attracted many vigorous and ambitious young men and women from the country. Often that has been well. One is entitled to do what he may love to do, if he loves to do anything. One is to be commended for casting his lot where he will, if he has head enough to think it out for himself. Such men carve out success, and many are heard of in the cities. The failures are never celebrated and the volume of them is never known. The farming sections have, of course, suffered because of the drift to the cities. There has not been much return drift. The reasons for it are not hard to find. Those reasons are, however, beginning to disappear. The return drift is setting in and seems likely to be strong in the next generation.

State Sentiment

The thinking of the State has hardly been balanced in the last decade. We have been having more solicitude about forest lands than farm lands, about forest trees than shade trees or fruit trees, about wild animals than tame ones, and about trotting horses than work horses. Last fall we had serious forest fires, which stirred our concern and aroused our interest. We seemed to be well provided with men, machinery, and implements for fighting them. We have developed a fine sentiment about our forest preserve. We have created an efficient State department to look after it. We have even got something about it in the Constitution. It is admirable, and we are proud of it. We are protecting our wild animals. One has to pay for it, and be disgraced everlastingly, if he has a wild hen in his larder at any time in eleven months of the year, if it can be proved that the hen, when in life, *was* wild. Just now they are trying to mulct a man in penalties and punish him for killing deer that were tame and that he bred and raised in his own paddock. Last winter the Legislature made it a misdemeanor for a farmer's boy to shoot weasels and woodchucks beyond the narrow limit of his father's farm, at any time of the year, without paying a dollar for a license to try it. We will not worry about that: it will eventuate all right. But insect pests destroy more value in farm products every year than fires destroy in value of forest

products in a generation. Our Science Division conservatively estimates that the annual insect destruction to our farm products amounts to \$24,000,000. Eastern Massachusetts has lately had to fight the gypsy moth, a great destroyer of shade trees. It is said that in 1907 that state, in cooperation with the municipalities affected, expended \$750,000 to fight this pest. Now it is added that these little scoundrels are migrating to the westward on parallel lines of latitude, and that the first division has even got as far as Springfield, and is advancing upon us with grim and sullen determination. If they get up to the New York line, we shall be likely to fight them with resources and energy enough to make them pale, because we shall be in comparison with Massachusetts and there will be some flavor of patriotism and rivalry about it. But fruit trees are as vital as forest trees! Hens are as much entitled to our respectful consideration as partridges! Jersey cows have as many claims upon us as deer! I recall a saying of Mr Beecher, that it was a great pity that people had to be born in India in order to hear Henry Scudder, the missionary, preach. Must we move to the mountains and the woods and live irregular lives in order to get that help for our common interests which none but the State can give?

How to Increase Earnings

There are ways by which our New York lands can earn more money, and the State is bound to help find them. We are not to do just as other states do. We have not the corn lands of Illinois and Iowa, nor the wheat lands of Minnesota and the Dakotas. But we have abundant facilities for producing things they can not grow, and we are close by great markets from which they are remote. It would be well, however, if we could see how much they are ahead of us in an all-important matter. That is, in the kind of education which they are sustaining, in the applications of the scientific knowledge which bears upon the productivity, and therefore upon the life and pleasure, of the farm.

There are two great lines of State policy which our combined action ought to assure. We ought to very carefully work them out in our minds, have them established by law, follow them persistently, and bide our time. One concerns a system of education which is calculated to sustain modern agriculture, and the other relates to the things which our combined intelligence and power may carry directly into all of the agricultural parts of the State to help the people of readiest wits who are most disposed to help themselves.

I have much in common with the practical farmer; I join him in his amusement over "gentlemen farmers," but remind him that he ought not to begrudge them the pleasure they get out of it, nor be unspeakably cut up about the money they spend in the country. I am with him in his contempt for "scientific" farming which will not work, but I remind him that there is much scientific farming which *will* work, with his practical help; and that his practical experience will not accomplish a great deal without scientific help.

The Rural Schools

I am, of course, far from contending that all that agriculture needs is to be supplied by public schools. There are other great factors in the problem. With agriculture, as with every other great interest and its attendant life, there is as much to be reckoned with outside as inside of the schools. But it is not too much to say that agriculture above almost any other great human or commercial interest, now claims the support of an adequate and comprehensive educational system.

Primary schools alone, no matter how good, can not supply the education which is required to make the most of the agricultural industries. The man who says high schools are unnecessary, in the country or anywhere else, is behind the times, and as much out of touch with rational educational policy as with the spirit of the country in which he lives. Nor is it going too far to say that colleges are as vital as high schools to a system of instruction which will be equal to the demands of agricultural necessity. The first national industry, which supplies the larger part of the raw material for our manufactures and produces four times as much in value as our mines and oil wells together, brings good policy to the aid of necessity in claiming the support of a universal system of education. It is not merely that the farmers' boys and girls, like all other American boys and girls, are entitled to their utmost chance: the nation's educational purpose has combined with situations and the importance of the industry to settle it.

I have many times discussed the improvement of the rural elementary schools and shall doubtless do so again, but I shall not go into that now beyond treating of the factors of an educational system which will support agricultural needs.

It seems to me that there is not much to be said in criticism of the rural schools so far as general elementary instruction is concerned. It is true that there is a lack of grading and an absence of

plan by which pupils may progress from one plane to another and continually look forward to higher work. But it is also true that the instruction is more individual, and that all of the pupils hear all of the instruction and all of the recitations in all subjects and in all grades of work. The rural schools are at least reasonably free from the overcrowding, the overdoing, and the overexploitation for all manner of ends that are so common in the cities. The teaching is by young women of an average competency which is now remarkably high, and no one is allowed to teach without proved competency which is reasonable. If there could be a uniform system of supervision by superintendents, who hold or can earn teachers' certificates, in districts that are small enough to make actual supervision possible; if such a system of supervision could be free from all partizanship; and if the supervisory districts could be arranged so as to have the village high schools at the centers, and relate all of the elementary schools to them in a way, there might be a universal system of schools for teaching elementary English branches in the country, quite as well adapted to the general needs of the country as those in the cities are adapted to the needs of the cities. And this might all very easily be.

But while the schools of both elementary and secondary grade in the country are serving, or may without difficulty be made to serve, the needs of the country in the ordinary branches of an English education, they are doing nothing to train specially for the vocation of farming. We have apparently come to the imperative need of training for the industrial vocations in the cities. We have been training for the professional vocations for more than a generation. There is quite as much basis of reason and right in popular education for the vocation of farming, as for mechanical, constructive, commercial, and professional businesses.

The agricultural situation is absolutely distinct from any other industrial situation, and if it is ever met efficiently it will have to be met in a very distinct way. It will never be met by making agricultural schools of the country primary schools. The children in the elementary schools are too young to want much agriculture; they want English, and mathematics, and the elementary sciences there. The primary children in the cities stand more in need of agriculture, than the primary children in the country. The primary schools in both city and country are all-around schools. Some of the city children will go to the country: some of the country children will go to the city. The education of the country child is not to be narrowed down to things rural. His books are not to exclude

illustrations from, and all other recognition of, rural life; but neither are they to exclude all else. His primary school is to be able to train him in the fundamentals of an all-around man, who will be free from all exclusiveness, and able to study and to do to the best advantage anything that his qualities and his tastes may dispose him to study and to do when the time comes.

We could not establish exclusive agricultural schools of primary grade even if we were to get wrongheaded and undertake it. All schools require balanced work until the time for specialization comes. Balanced work requires elements that relate to the country as well as those that relate to the cities, and vice versa. There are higher laws and fundamental principles concerning education, and they bear alike upon all parts of the country and upon all manner of people. If we violate these laws or break these principles, the people soon come to realize it and trouble is, as it ought to be, let loose upon us.

We have heard much about nature study. I recognize its value. I intend no offense to those who have much pleasure in it. It is good. But it is equally good for *all* children, as cutting paper, and weaving mats, and molding clay, and the like, are good for all children. All of these things make for all-around culture, for all-around outlook, and for all-around love for work and for facility in doing. Nature study is quite likely to appeal less to the country child than to the city child for obvious reasons, and, while it is to be encouraged in the country as in the city, it apparently has about the same relation to real agriculture that sloyd has to laying out an electric plant for a city, or laying down the keel for a battleship. In other words, it is a good thing—a good thing everywhere, because it helps mold the character of boys and girls and keeps the way open for what may come after, but calling it agricultural instruction will not increase its importance so much as it will confuse some minds and subject us to the criticism that we are not doing what we proclaim.

We are asked to encourage the teaching of agriculture in the elementary schools. I am for doing it so far as is practically possible. I admit, however, that I am at a loss to know what are the phases of real agriculture which are adaptable to the primary schools or how to install them in ways that will dispose children to become interested in them. I know of many things which look to quickening and dignifying the different agricultural industries, in which the children of farmers are likely to find in-

terest and which are not incompatible with the plan and purpose of the elementary schools, and I am for introducing them into the course of study; but I confess that I am unable to see the reasonableness or the practicability of teaching real *agriculture*, any more than engineering or medicine, in the elementary schools. Agriculture is not an elementary subject.

We are asked to have the normal schools train teachers of agriculture for the elementary and secondary schools. Some of the normal school teachers know something about some of the sciences that are fundamental to agriculture, and some of them know something about some of the practical methods of farming, although I suspect that not many of them would claim overmuch. The fact is that nine tenths of the students in the normal schools who will ever teach at all are girls. It is so, and doubtless it will continue to be so. Ambitious men who go beyond the high schools are going to the colleges. And the gods of the Greeks, mean and sordid as they were, would laugh at the spectacle of girl teachers training farmers' boys old enough to receive it, in the intricacies of real agriculture. Generations will come and go before there is any substantial result to agriculture through the girls in the normal schools.

In the last year or two the State has made appropriations to establish three secondary schools of agriculture. This has been in response to a general sentiment in favor of agricultural education, made without very full consideration of the true relations which education must sustain to agriculture in order to be effectual, and without any definite general plan about agricultural education in New York. These schools will be of little avail to education, unless they are made a part of the educational system, and they will not be of much ultimate service to agriculture unless they are made to articulate with schools below and schools above them; and it will be well, before we go further, to thresh out the whole subject and determine upon a plan which will be comprehensive enough to be worthy of the State and of real worth to its agriculture and all of its other interests.

Wholly aside from the absence of plan about where we are going or where we are coming out, it is a very open question whether it will be well for the State to set up a few schools of a secondary grade in agriculture, or whether we should expect counties or townships to do it, or whether we should develop agricultural instruction in the existing high schools. The Education Department has been multiplying and enlarging agricultural subjects in the academic syllabus for the village high schools, and we are to be guided some-

what by the ultimate policy of the State in the premises. The high schools, unlike the elementary schools, are upon an educational grade where the fundamentals of agriculture are quite practicable, and where the pupils are old enough to begin to have some real interest in the subject. Without discussing that, the interests of the State in general, and of agriculture in particular, clearly call for discussion and for a plan of procedure to the end that time, effort, and money be not wasted and substantial results indefinitely delayed.

It has not been the American plan to segregate instruction and students — certainly it has not been the plan where circumstances have not compelled it. The strength of the universities has been increased by the very coordination of their colleges; the strength of teachers and the potentiality of teaching have been enhanced by association with other teachers and other teaching; and the efficiency of students has been promoted by contacts with other subjects and with other students than those within the limitations of their own particular subject and their own particular class. It has not been common anywhere in the country to establish State schools below the college grade except for defectives or dependents, unless in association with a large and comprehensive institution, and it is not too much to say that no school of agriculture in this or in any other country has become markedly successful which was not associated with a real university or had not become in fact, if not in name, a real university itself. And I am bound to look with some regret upon any New York policy which would put students of agriculture in an inclosure by themselves and deny to them the associations with other students which their interests imperatively demand.

There are practical as well as educational difficulties. For example, the courses at these schools will have to be progressive and extend over a term of years in order to have any respectable result; and unless their number is to be indefinitely extended — unless, for example, there shall be at least one in every county — students will have to be separated from home and live at these schools for terms, semesters, and years together. The break with the home will have to be practically as complete as it is with college students. And the break will have to come before the college age. The State will probably not multiply these schools to the number of forty or sixty, and the interests of the home, of the pupils, and of the schools, will hardly suffer the separation from the home before the college age. Then why not do the best we can for agriculture and for farmers' boys and girls, as for all scientific subjects and for all voca-

tional training, in the existing local high schools, and when pupils are able and disposed to go away from home to school, prepare them for college and send them to an adequate college, and have the benefit of it? And, looking at the other side of it, why enter upon or pursue a policy which must make the public high school in the smaller villages merely a preparatory school for the literary colleges? These high schools are the people's colleges. 82.8% of all public high schools and academic departments in the State are to be found in villages of less than 5000 inhabitants, and 71.7% are in villages of less than 2000. It must of necessity work great harm to these village high schools if agricultural work is to be sharply separated from them. Why enter upon a course which will weaken them on the literary and scientific side, and withhold the aid which they can give to the agricultural side better than any schools that are likely to be established? Why begin to exclude from them the things which are and must continue to be of the widest popular concern? Why not determine that the high schools shall be broadened so that they will meet every need of all of their constituents, at least up to the time when pupils are mature enough to go from home to go to college? Science and agriculture are inseparable. Scientific training and research, associated with practical demonstrations, are the sum and substance of any real agricultural advance. No one who has had any experience in organizing a school of agriculture, with lands and implements and animals for practical demonstrations, and who knows the difficulties and expense of organization and maintenance, will believe that there will be any considerable number of such schools established and efficiently sustained in this State. Such as are not in articulation with an institution of higher learning will not be efficient. Nor, if established, will they be largely attended by pupils of high school age who have to go far from home. And all around the village high schools there is already "practical" agriculture in abundance. It is fully up to the high school plane. Unless there is extreme care at the point where the ways are likely to part, there is great danger of projecting roads which will lead from, rather than to, the greatest good, not only to New York agriculture, but to New York education as well.

An Agricultural College

No educational system capable of adequately supporting the agriculture of a state will be complete without an agricultural college.

One with experience in developing an agricultural college worthy of the name will know that there will not be many of these institutions in the same state, no matter how great the state may be. In such a college the best scientific training and the deepest scientific research are imperative. If they are not of the best and the deepest they will be of no avail, and they can hardly be such apart from the teachers, the investigators, and the laboratories to be found at a real university. At a real agricultural college the most exact and reliable experiments and demonstrations are also imperative and there are both educational and financial reasons in abundance why these will not be much duplicated, or often realized apart from a university. In all phases of higher education what is good is not cheap, and what is cheap is not good. It is no less true — doubtless it is more true — in the higher study of agriculture than in any other phase of advanced education. And the higher learning is quite as vital to agriculture as to any other interest of the people. Then, a real agricultural college, associated with a true university, is the true policy in this State, and such a college may be expected to vitalize whatever is done in connection with agriculture in the high schools; and whatever has a bearing upon agriculture in the elementary schools: and it may also be expected to incite and uplift profitable agricultural operations among the people. Then, whether or not an erroneous initiative has been given to provision for agricultural instruction of elementary and secondary grades in this State, we have made no mistake concerning agricultural teaching of the college grade.

The State has recently built new agricultural college buildings, and provided for developing a real agricultural college, at Cornell University. There are those who ask, "Why has not Cornell, with New York's share of the land grant funds, developed a real agricultural college before now?" I am not one of these, because I know something of the difficulties which have been in the way. These difficulties have persisted until now, but happily they are giving way. They have related to the scarcity of competent teachers with enthusiasm in the subject; to the absence of students who could matriculate in a college; to the absence of any actual and intelligent interest in agriculture on the part of the universities; and to the absence of any rational plan of the agriculturists for agricultural education. The western farmers have had more value at stake in their farms than we have, and they have had to be more aggressive; and the measure of influence, if not of control, which

they have had over the State universities has enabled them to solve difficulties and find ways for making agricultural colleges actually serviceable. Out of it all, the ways to that end are much clearer there and here than they used to be. The available funds of Cornell have all been used in other directions, and if anything worth while was to be done the State has had to do it, and I have been very glad that it has done it and not made the mistake, in agricultural college work at least, of so scattering its benefactions and its directions that there would be only indifferent results.

The Need of Democracy in Agricultural Education

So far, so good — but that is far from the sum of the matter. Before any system of higher education can be of substantial advantage to farming, it will have to have its head in a democratic and a sympathetic, as well as a real, university. Cornell University is a real university. Its ideals and its scholarship have been high. Its offerings have extended into wide fields, and its equipment has been measurably sufficient. But its disposition has never been so democratic as its management has desired it to be, or believed that it was, and its sympathy with the agricultural industries has never been so consuming as to lead it to rise to very high altitudes in things agricultural, or to surmount the real obstacles to agricultural investigation and instruction. It is not the fault of a board of trustees, a president, a dean, or a professor. The trouble is beyond either. It will never be cured unless the university becomes the real instrument of the State, nor until there is a strong factor in the board of trustees so keenly interested in agriculture that it will use its power to compel the university to accomplish the really great agricultural ends which can be effected in no other way.

In other words, the erection of buildings for a college of agriculture at Cornell University is not enough to insure much result to New York agriculture. The gathering of a faculty, the laying down of offerings, and the installation of an equipment, are not enough. That college will not only have to be as educationally respectable as any other college in the university, but it will have to stand in vital and living relations with every other. No matter how elaborately equipped it may be, it will accomplish relatively little unless it has the fellowship and the stimulus of the union of colleges and graduate school which we call the university. It will not bear large fruits unless it has to respond to the demands of a real constituency with large interests, nor until the purposes of

representatives of that constituency, who have the intelligence and the authority to undertake to accomplish particular things, have to be met.

All of the natural sciences, physics, chemistry, zoology, physiology, bacteriology, embryology, thremmatology; the social and political sciences, history, economics, the mechanical arts, and divers phases of engineering; great practical experience, and a large amount of horse sense, are inseparably involved in that high agricultural development which must be had in the State of New York if her agriculture is to keep pace with the other commercial and intellectual activities of the State. Of course, all the people engaged in farming can not be equipped with all of this knowledge, but a considerable part of them must be, to the end that they may lead the way; and when such men lead the way all the rest will be copying larger men and better methods than they have sufficient opportunity to copy now. And there must be a place which will not only initiate new undertakings and lift old ones to higher planes, but to which any occult difficulty may be taken for investigation and report. And investigation and teaching, scientific research and the training of teachers and superintendents, must go together because one is as vital as the other, and each inspires and energizes the other. And with it all there must be, in the agricultural college at least, the ever present feeling that agriculture is our most important business, and that the college which can quicken it has a larger mission and is entitled to a fuller reward than any other kind of a college which the ingenuity of man and the generosity of a people have ever been able to put upon its feet. These specifications call for nothing short of a real university under some considerable measure of popular control.

Things Outside of the Schools

There are things to be done in the interests of New York agriculture, outside of the schools. There need be no squeamishness about doing them. There need be no hesitation about asking the State to do them when only the State can do them. It is clearly within the scope of the political power of the people to promote an overwhelming common interest by combined action, when it can not be done individually. It is unmistakably so when the people acting together actually do so much to enlighten the political and professional life and culture of the State, and when they do so much to support so many of the commercial interests of the people. After

all that has been done in many other directions, agriculture need not hesitate; and others need not sneer, when agriculture ventures and asks.

For example, we ought to have a competent and complete agricultural survey made of all of the farming lands of this State. The farmers should be told rather closely of the general attributes of the soil of the different counties and of its chemical elements as well. They should be told, in a general way but with some particularity and definiteness, how it may be used to the best advantage. One may say that they do know. Certainly they know much about it, but if the subject were to be intensively inquired into they would themselves be surprised at the number of things which have not yet occurred to them. Quite as certainly there are some things which common usage shows that many of them do not realize. They should be told of the additions which are needed to restore what has been taken out, or to adapt it to the demands of new situations. They should not have to take this from commercial corporations that are selling fertilizers. They should not go on putting on stuff that contains nitrogen and no phosphorus, when what the ground needs is phosphorus and not nitrogen. They should not go on selling products containing constituents that the soil requires, when they are worth more to keep than to sell. The common belief among farmers, that mere rotation of crops rests and recuperates the soil, is doubtless fallacious beyond the fact that some crops do not deplete soil as rapidly as others do. What has been taken out, what needs to be restored, should be declared by competent authority acting for and responsible to the farming interests. What may be profitably grown, having in view the factors in the soil, and the facilities for changing those factors, and the new facilities for transportation, and the new demands of the markets, ought to be asserted by undoubted authority. For example, again, if four fifths of all of the farm animals in New York were to be destroyed by some noxious disease, it would seem a great hardship, but if the pest would discriminate in favor of the one fifth which it spared the fact would in the end be a real gain. We are continuing the propagation of great herds of mongrel animals which are commonly less serviceable than those which we might breed, and which often are not worth their keep. We fall far short of producing the best horses sufficient for our needs, either for all-around or particular service. Every farm ought to have at least one new colt every spring. He should have a pedigree that he could be as proud of as a Son of the Revolution, or a member of the Mayflower Society.

He should not be expected to trot a mile in less than three minutes, but by the time he is four years old he should be worth at least three hundred dollars and create a sort of savings bank account for his owner. We are the first dairy state in the Union, but we have much to learn about milk cows and scientific dairying before we can be the first dairy country in the world. Of course, we have some fine dairy herds, and of course we have some up-to-date dairymen, but do any of us doubt that we have hundreds of thousands of dairy cattle which are too mean to keep, or that the very common practices of handling dairy products are alike a menace and a disgrace to us? Ample knowledge upon the subject is available, and the real prosperity and pleasure of dairying, as well as the common safety of the people, depend upon observing it. Why not have the State make it known and compel us all to observe it? Indeed, why not have the State propagate the most desirable and profitable animals of the farm, and actually aid farmers in propagating such for themselves? There are a half dozen German states which have more money invested in buildings and grounds for a veterinary college alone, than the State of New York or its people have invested in veterinary science since the Mohawk began to pour into the Hudson. The Imperial Government of Japan has recently been studying the matter of hens, and, with its customary habit of taking care, has just sent two trusted representatives to England to select the finest specimens of two breeds which it has decided are best adapted of any in the world to the needs of Japan. Why did they not take American hens? Doubtless because they found that all chickens look much alike to most Americans. The proof of our indifference to domestic chickens is cumulative. Yet our State has \$15,000,000 invested in poultry, and there is as much difference in the individuality, and the productivity, and the respectability, and the value, of hens, as there is in horses, or cattle, or sheep, or swine, or people. This is an ideal State for first-class chickens and plenty of them, and why should we permit ourselves to be the seventh State in the Union when it comes to such attractive and money-making creatures of the farm? We smile about it, but other peoples make them the subject of governmental care. Then there are the other large matters of small fruits, and vegetables, and flowers for the markets. Here and there one gets rich through the discriminating propagation of one or the other, but most of us seem to blindly suppose that they are wholly dependent upon their own spontaneity, and that there is nothing to do but to leave them

to nature and to chance. Yet there are other states and other nations which see that it is worth much more than it costs to make each of them the subject of the investigations and the teachings of a distinct department of a university. Then there is the vital subject of horticulture in its larger aspects, with its infinite claims and its unspeakable possibilities. The apples, pears, grapes, and nuts; the forests; the shade trees; all phases of landscape architecture and gardening, demand the oversight and the leadership and the aid of the State on both the scientific and practical sides. Yet again, there is the still larger subject of the homemaking, with its architecture and sanitation, the matter of decorations, the comforts and conveniences, with the adaptation of foods to the family needs, and the thousand things which with attention will make the life of the mother an easier one, and the possibilities of the children different and greater than they otherwise would be. And right there is the overwhelming consideration to which all others must be contributory, and before which every other pales into insignificance, and that is the public need of knowing that boys and girls are the first concern of a State; the public obligation to do the material things which will dispose every farm boy and farm girl to look upon farming not for the sake of the farm more than for their own sake, not as repellent drudgery, but as the high grade business that it is.

All these things are outside of the schools, but they have to proceed from the prevalent system of education and they all relate back to the schools. In a word, from which there can hardly be any dissent, the prosperity and the pleasure of a great industry depend upon the completeness, the symmetry, and the cooperative efficiency of the parts of the educational system which enter into its details and give rationale and character to it as a whole. And in another word, from which I do not expect dissent, the states which lay the most emphasis upon those phases of learning which bear directly upon the mechanical and agricultural industries, and which carry them right to the homes of the people, will enjoy the largest commercial prosperity and will have the happiest and the strongest populations.

New York Behind in Agricultural Education

I do not often find myself in the attitude of a critic of the Empire State, but it must be said that New York is far from the front in developing policies and establishing instrumentalities to aid either the mechanical or the agricultural industries. With the prestige

and the advantage of being an old state, it would be strange if we did not suffer some of the disadvantages of it. Let me point out what the educational disadvantages concerning agriculture are, and *why* they are, and let us believe that we may cure them if we will.

The federal Constitution left, as it was bound to leave, universities, as all other schools, to be propagated by the states. In every state formed after the adoption of "the more perfect union" the state Constitution provided for a system of schools, and ordinarily for a state university. The western pioneers had a dreadfully hard time, but they had the pride and nerve which kept it to themselves. They were bound to build up new states to rival the old ones, and they realized that a comprehensive educational system was the only corner stone which such a new state could have. If they had little to do with, they were at least fortunate in the fact that there was nothing in the way. Even public universities were established in all of the newer states. The people laid the foundations of comprehensive educational systems, and crowned the systems with public universities. The potential power of all this has not been realized until the coming of wealth within the last twenty-five years.

Forty-six years ago the general government provided a gift of thirty thousand acres of land to each state for each senator and representative in Congress, upon condition that the state would use the proceeds for the propagation of a university which, without ignoring other branches of liberal learning, would lay particular emphasis upon those bearing upon agriculture and the mechanic arts. The act was passed after a long struggle. It was passed more than once. It was vetoed by Buchanan. It was signed by the great Lincoln. This act was as epoch making in education as the Declaration of Independence was in political progress, or as the Ordinance of '87 was in the advance of public enlightenment and morality.

The newer states had the larger part in procuring its passage, and they were the quickest and the keenest to claim their rights under it. They had the freer democracy. They were in the pioneer stage. They lacked nothing in assertiveness. They wanted all that the older states had, and much more. Universal education became speedily a universal passion. Their institutions were yet in the liquid state. The federal grant would aid their already existent state universities, or support others. They had the system which could seize the opportunity. Every one of them managed to comply with the terms and lay hold upon the grants. For the twenty-five

years following the war, they often had a hard time complying with the requirements, but they held on. Then the country had filled up. More acres were put under the plow, and all the acres were made more productive. Wealth grew. In the eighties, and still more in the nineties, land grant institutions had developed more highly educated constituencies, and, quite as important, they began to show the people who were engaged in the commercial, manufacturing, transportation, and agricultural industries, how to make more money. That settled it. Nothing succeeds like success. They went after more money and now each gets \$50,000 per year beyond the proceeds of the land grants. And now, again, every one of the newer states puts into its state university or land grant college more than it gets from the federal grants, and some of them twenty times as much. They are not fools: they are more intent than ever on having all of the education that any state has, with some to spare; the roads are filled with the coming and going of students. Nebraska and Wisconsin each has a larger proportion of college students than either New York or Massachusetts. There are graduates, and therefore trained agents, of the universities in every village and upon almost every farm; and all the people stand ready to make further investments where they will pay. They are not doing it for mere love. They see that there is money in it. Added to the natural educational enthusiasm, that concludes matters.

The older states did practically nothing. They are only now opening their eyes. Their ignorance of patent facts is as monumental as it is stupid. Of course, the old order is in the way. It is the habit of the old order to question the academic quality of the new order of institutions. One college president laments that the people put their hands into the people's treasury to promote higher education. Another challenges the applicability of liberal learning to the industries. Still another says, as bluntly as it can be said in classical phrase, that it is all wrong to educate people out of their environment. And yet another looks through spectacles that are befogged with the literary and philosophical training of the ages, and stoutly denies that what actually *is*, can be. It is not strange. Neither men nor institutions can be made over in a minute, after they are fifty years of age. The old order is the persistent expression of social, political, and educational aristocracy. The new order is the advance agent of educational and industrial democracy. The new order is as sure to persist as the Republic is to endure, for it is only the logical outworking of the democracy of the nation. It is sure to go in every

state, for the nation will never endure half slave and half free educationally, any more than politically.

In New York we are as yet in the old order. We are not quite so hidebound as some who live in the still more educationally effete East. Some men and some facts have helped us. But we are a long way from being out in the clear sunlight. We almost lost the advantage of the federal grants to higher learning for the masses and the industries of the people, and would have done so absolutely but for Andrew D. White and Ezra Cornell, both senators of this State; one a scholar and educational organizer, who had been a professor in the State University of Michigan, and the other an inventor and industrial organizer, a millionaire, and withal a philanthropist. Between them, with these qualities, and being in the Senate, they got up the best scheme that was practicable under the circumstances, rescued the grant to New York from utter failure by providing an endowment and creating an institution which could take it and try to meet the State's obligations concerning it. The State did nothing. It merely stood by and benevolently let the thing be done. The result was Cornell University. I have never been quite able to see how the scheme held together and worked out legally, but I imagine that, as it cost the State nothing, it was looked upon with a good measure of legal and administrative considerateness, as it certainly deserved to be. By reason of the sagacious location of the State lands, by other gifts, and by hard struggling, a great and influential university has grown up on the hillside at Ithaca. By reason of the circumstances of its origin, of its imperative legal obligations, and of the fact that its first two presidents — with joint terms of twenty-four years — were professors from the University of Michigan, it partook of the form, of many of the factors, and of much of the spirit of the state universities. Because of the scholarships, and for other reasons, it stands in rather close relations to our State system of education. All honor to the men who have done it, and to all of the men and women whose sympathies have entered into it. But it would be idle to say that in any essential way it sustains the relation of either a state university or an industrial college to the Empire State. It does not, and it can not, because it is not under popular control, and can not be responsive to the natural impulses of our unfolding political and industrial democracy, nor can its practical ministrations be accepted by the people as they would be if there were the sense of public proprietorship in it.

Aid to Wives and Daughters

Up to this time we have been thinking about the training which essentially relates to men, and about farming operations outside of the house. It would be a mistake to leave the subject without a word as to the special training of the women who live in the country, and as to the education which enters directly into the making of the farmer's home. To accomplish any large results men and women must not only work together, but they must have equal advantages; they must be equally enthusiastic and aggressive, and the work of each must be equally regarded and respected by the other. There is a lack of such equality of outlook and opportunity in New York education. The women have less chance; not so much special training either in or out of the schools, not so many social contacts, not so many implements to do with, and not so much to stimulate and liberalize their work either within their own homes or in comparisons between different homes. There are notable exceptions, but we have necessarily to deal with generalities. Of course, I intend no reflections upon a class of women who are as justly entitled to the highest respect for doing all they do under circumstances that are often discouraging, as they are entitled to an open educational chance with the men, which very commonly they do not get. If the women could be put in charge of the farm, the operations would doubtless go quite as well as they do now; but if the men were to be put in charge of the house, the better part of them would either lie down under the burden or there would be so many changes and so many new conveniences and fixings and implements that the treasury would be bankrupted. I am not saying that all of the fault is with the men, although a good share of it belongs to some men. I once sat behind two farmers' wives through an admirable cooking demonstration at a county "domestic science" association. At the conclusion one said to the other, "I suppose this thing is all right for these city and university women, but I can cook without any of their help." Doubtless she could, and quite as doubtless she belonged to a class who have as much to learn about the most desirable and economical food supplies, and the question of nutrition, and the manner of preparation, and the time for use, and the manner of serving, as I have to learn about a million things. And that is far from all there is of it. It reaches to the making, the sanitation, and the decoration of the house, to the furnishings and conveniences of the home, to the deep subject of home economics and household management, and to all that most

effectually brings the vital support of the home to the support of the work upon the farm. It may make the life of the family something to which ambitious boys and girls will cling; even something to which, being added to the rational and cordial welcome of their fathers and mothers, they will be proud to invite their friends.

In a word, in considering the educational needs of New York agriculture, the education, the liberal and special education, of women claims quite as much as that of men. There is quite as much necessity of specialization for girls as for boys, when the time for specialization comes. The courses in the secondary schools, whatever form the school is to take, are bound to regard the work of girls as well as that of boys, and there will be no complete or symmetrical college of agriculture unless there is associated with it a department of household economy, with the many offerings which go to the bottom of all the problems of the household upon the farm. Nor will there be sufficient result until the need of it is recognized among the people. And it may as well be added that, when such courses are provided, there will not be much result unless girls can go and take them with just as much independence, and security, and common respect as any boy upon the grounds. If this can not be until boys are taught some lessons, the date of entering upon that process should not be long postponed.

Suggestions

In summary, I submit the following suggestions concerning the educational basis of the agricultural industries:

There should be a complete and interrelated system of schools, elementary, secondary, and higher, open to all, and essentially under the control of the people of the State.

The elementary school should be within reach of every farmer's home. So long as the school is adequately sustained and competently taught, the location may be left to the people of the district. It is more a question of expediency than of educational principle, and there is no balance of advantages in school concentration to justify forcefully overthrowing an established order.

The elementary schools are to teach the elements of an all-around English education. They can not specialize much, and they are not to be in any sense exclusive. They are to aim at fitting children for the choice of any vocation they may prefer and for beginning the preparation therefor. They are always to preach the gospel of work, and to use books, objects and methods to stimulate

quite as much interest — and in the country perhaps more interest — in agriculture as in any other industry. This should be guarded in making the elementary syllabus. The work of the elementary schools, in the country as in the cities, should not dawdle and waste time through the multiplicity of books and the idle exploitation of pedagogical theories and methods. It should be definite quantitatively, as well as efficient qualitatively. The attendance laws should be enforced in the country as in the cities, even though the extent of child labor upon the farm, and the distance of the school makes neglect of the law very frequent and the difficulties of enforcement very great. The course should be simplified and shortened, and the child brought to the end of it with the assurance that he has some definite knowledge and measure of efficiency, by the time he is fourteen years of age. Better professional supervision should establish some satisfactory basis of graduation from a country elementary school, and graduation should qualify the pupil for admission to the high school, or to a distinct agricultural school.

There should be an approved high school within driving distance of every home. In this school there must be provision for an all-around high school training which will fit for college or technical school, and there should be a distinct cleavage in the interest of agriculture where pupils will elect it. Where there is sufficient demand for it to justify a distinct agricultural school of secondary grade, on a parallel with the trades schools which we are beginning to organize in the cities, and such course can be taken without weakening the established high schools, as it may be in the cities, argument will go some way to support a distinct agricultural as well as a distinct trades school; but I never expect to concede that agriculture does not rest upon a broader basis than mechanics, and that the management of a farm does not exact a wider field of knowledge than the training of workmen. Whether special training in agriculture be carried on in the established high schools or in distinct schools is largely a matter of expediency and convenience. Let it be done in the neighboring village high school, or in a distinct school to be developed by a combination of districts or towns, or possibly by all the towns of a county, or wherever it promises to be most convenient and best. But, wherever done, it must train both boys and girls, and expect that they will live at home. The work must be fundamental to agriculture; that is, it must teach the natural sciences, something of economics, much of common business usage, and a great deal of the simpler phases of agronomy, horti-

culture, floriculture, vegetable culture, animal husbandry including dairying, home making, or anything else connected with the industries of the farm, so long as it can be done with the facilities which are practicable in such a school, with the life of the home and all the surrounding environment for illustration and experiment. But the general training should go far enough to largely relieve the student from the study of the English branches if he goes to the agricultural college. It is of a grade of book work which may be quite as well done in the local school, and the student should not be sent to the college so deficient in the ordinary English branches as to make it necessary for the college to devote much time to it to the exclusion of work in technical agriculture. And the technical agriculture in the high school should count as much as any other work in credits, and also for admission to the agricultural college for those who will be disposed to go there.

It would have been better if we could have well considered, and have reached definite conclusions concerning schools of agriculture of secondary grade, before any such schools were attempted by the State. Certainly others should not be provided for unless after full consideration and upon some well understood plan. If the established schools are not to undertake this work, and the State is to do it directly, and there are to be forty or sixty of these schools, and if they are to meet real educational standards, then there is little to regret. If not, and if some agricultural work is to be done in the present high schools, and if a small number of these State schools can be firmly established between the existent high schools and the agricultural college, they might justify their cost. But there are real difficulties in the way. It is likely to be hard enough for them to secure enough intending agricultural students and provide enough real agricultural instruction to justify their cost, when they are associated with a college or university, as at St Lawrence and Alfred. It is quite possible, however. It will prove impossible for one which is wholly independent of a college to do that, unless the State is to make a college, and not a high school, of it; and that would mean an expense which has not been thought of, and a rival to the State College at Cornell which has not been intended. It has been suggested that the proposed school at Morrisville, which is as yet wholly unorganized, be transferred to Colgate University, an excellent institution but five or six miles away, and the suggestion seems worthy of serious consideration. It might be held to be unthinkable cruel for the State to

wholly recall any institution of this kind which it had once agreed to provide, and I would be glad enough if the State would establish such a school at every college in the State which would be strengthened by, or be hospitable to it, if, after discussion, it should be thought well to make that the general plan. But the State educational system would like to know just what the educational policy of the State concerning secondary instruction in agriculture is to be.

It will be good State policy to give liberal support to the State College of Agriculture and expect to make large demands upon it. An agricultural college is bound to be a college as much as any other kind of institution which claims the name of college. Strong teachers and many offerings will have to precede the coming of students. No state will be likely to support more than one that will make much of an impression upon its agriculture. The offerings must be largely in agricultural technique. The equipment should be even larger in fields and barns and herds, than in libraries and laboratories, because the student should have a reasonable English education before he goes to college, and because when an agricultural college has the large advantage of being a college in a university, it may count much upon the privileges which are common to all. By the time one who is to live on a farm goes away from home to an agricultural college, it is time he was given his fill of agricultural instruction that is actual and real. But a real college, properly sustained by the schools below, will gather students who can matriculate and thus make an impression upon the State which will endure. The State Agricultural College must be sensitive to rational and responsible agricultural initiative. It must not only train men to manage farms, but it must train teachers for agricultural work in the schools below. It must be scholarly, but it must be as democratic as it is scholarly. There are people who think that impossible. Therein lies the difference between the old academic scholarship and the newer industrial scholarship. Other states have found that difference and reckoned with it more than once. We can beat them all if we will. The State Agricultural College must not only be sensitive to the initiative of others; it must have an initiative of its own. It must find out the things which New York agriculture needs to have done and go right ahead doing them, knowing that if they work it will get the glory, and if they fail it will be damned for it. Teaching and research must go together. They always help one another. The State College of Agriculture and the United States and New York State Agricultural Experiment Stations are

bound to supplement each other. Ithaca and Geneva are not far apart, and the roads between them are very pleasant. Between them they are bound to investigate, supply information, and have an opinion upon every problem a New York farmer will bring to them, and when they do it the New York farmers are bound to listen to them. They are to supply energy and guidance to every farmers' organization and every agricultural enterprise. In theory and in fact they are to assume the leadership in a great system of education which adequately supports our fundamental and our greatest industry.

We should enter upon a great system of agricultural extension. The schools, from highest to lowest, should act in accord, not only in training students and in scientific research, but in carrying knowledge to the very doors of the farmers. Evangelistic work in agriculture should go everywhere. Seed specials should be run over the railroads. The blood of the best farm animals should be distributed throughout the State. Object lessons of special interest to both men and women should be carried in all directions. The applications should be especially adapted to every section, and the fullest attention should be given to the less favored rather than to the more favored counties of the State.

I hesitate not a moment in saying that the State might well send a commission of practical farmers and trained scientists, or, perhaps better, a commissioner who is experienced in farming, informed in economics, and trained scientifically, to any country in the world that seems able to send us anything in the way of farm products or domestic animals that will be of advantage to us, with authority to buy, and directions to learn whatever would be of advantage to our agriculture. I noticed in the New York papers of this morning that New Jersey has just imported fourteen Percheron and Clydesdale horses to extend the breeding of these magnificent draft horses among her people. And I know of another State which has sent one man to Germany to study veterinary colleges, another to Denmark to study dairying, and a third to Argentine to investigate beef cattle. There are scores of similar subjects which individuals can not exploit because they do not know what to do, or are without the money or the inclination to engage in large undertakings. In such circumstances it is clearly within the functions of the State to act. There is no smack of paternalism or socialism about it. All good governments do it in order to aid the industries of the people. It involves no large amount of money, in view of the sums to which

the State is accustomed. But it can not be done by agents who know little about it or who are more concerned about themselves than about the enduring interests of a great State. If honestly and capably done, the sentiment of the State would cordially sustain it. And if it were done through the State Agricultural College, or the Agricultural Experiment Station, or one of the State schools of agriculture, there would be sufficient assurance that whatever was undertaken would be scientifically initiated and well and wisely carried out.

Conclusion

There are perhaps three great fundamental factors in the distributive wealth of a state; namely, natural resources, commercial situation, and the intelligence which puts them to the very best use. The largest factor in natural resources is doubtless the tillable soil. We can not claim that the proportion of our potential soil to acreage is equal to that of some of the prairie states, but there is no doubt whatever that, with existing farm values, our soil may be made to yield quite as large a return upon investment as that of any other state. Aside from that, nature has been exceedingly kind to us. In the association of arable lands with mountains, and rivers, and lakes, and forests, and glens, and waterfalls, and with rainfalls and climate, and all that stimulates the imagination and makes for the physical and moral health of the people, we stand second to no state in the Union. In the association of all this with commercial situation, we easily have the advantage of them all. And we will never admit that we lack the sense or the wits to act together and make the most of what nature and situation have done for us.

We have much to demoralize our thinking, but we may well remember that the things in the life of a people which are of utmost and enduring worth invariably go back to Mother Earth. Manufactures are dependent. Importations are uncertain. We may not always take toll of the commerce that comes through both our eastern and our western doors and is carried over our highways. Our great metropolitan city may not always be the clearing house of the nation's business, and even though it is, the profits will continue to go into relatively few hands. Mother Earth will never forsake and she will never deceive us. Neither will she permit us to trifle with her. One who can not afford to lose, can not afford to speculate in uncertain and demoralizing crops any more than in uncertain and demoralizing securities. Nor can he afford to go on in the way which did well enough when we were wholly an agricul-

tural people, when children were seasoned through doing their share of the work, when books were few, and when the simple district school joined with the work of the farm to support a simple, but none the less a noble, civilization. We will be misguided if we do not continue to abide with Mother Earth and follow the course which will continue to make the most of her.

And we shall be a witless as well as a misguided people if we do not combine to ascertain from the reports of the markets and the work of the laboratories what may be done without much risk, and if we do not adjust ourselves to the more complex, the more intelligent, and the better life of our day in a way which will enable our properties to get our share out of it. The farmhouse will have to have the essential conveniences and connections of the city house. The boys and girls will have to have the things which they know other boys and girls have. The young men and maidens will have to have a good time of it and be able to find the ways for meeting their reasonable ambitions. The shorter working day and all the better conditions of labor will have to be reckoned with. The comfort, and the enlightenment, and the moral betterment of all in the household will have to be sedulously studied and generously provided for.

Of course the social, and educational, and industrial combination will give help to such as accord with it and are capable of making use of its advantages, but the personal equation will have to settle things upon each farm, and the personal attributes of the individual farmer will have to prevail. But while, no matter what the general level of intelligence and sagacity, some will fail and complain, and some will prosper and be happy, yet, there is no doubt about the public attitudes and the common undertakings of a people being often vital to the progress of men and women who deserve to prosper. In this sense the people and the government of New York have occasion enough to do much to widen the door of opportunity to all of our agricultural industries.

To find the true and sure ways for widening that door, a new body of learning is quite as necessary as old-time practical experience in farming. It is no easy task. Both educationists and farmers will have to bury their conceits and enter upon the breaking out of new roads with all modesty of opinion.

Governor Hughes has given us an admirable Commissioner of Agriculture. Liberally and specially educated, in full sympathy with the new spirit of agriculture, with youth and ambition and yet with

considerable experience and undoubted effectiveness in administration, the appointment of Mr Pearson to the headship of the agricultural activities of the State is altogether timely and encouraging. I am anxious that the forces which he and I represent shall work in rational cooperation, and that each shall bring out the best there is in learning and in labor. A new system of agriculture and a new system of education will have to join forces. Farmers and educationists will have to join hands in arranging the details of a new system of education and in making new plans about work. I am sure we have all come to the time when we shall be glad to have it so. If we have, the rest of it will not be so difficult after all. Both agriculture and education will be the gainers by it. Our education will more completely aid the evolution of our industrial democracy, our education will be quickened by enlarged industrial efficiency, and our agriculture will more surely come into the possession of its own again.

CONSERVING CHILDHOOD

ADDRESS BEFORE THE NATIONAL CHILD LABOR COMMITTEE AT ITS
FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING, CHICAGO, ILL., JANUARY 22, 1909

It is yet to be proved that a wide-open democracy like ours can do some of the things which a well ordered political society needs to have done, as well as more centralized forms of government do them with apparent ease. Indeed, it is yet to appear that we can make good the fundamental principle of our political creed and assure equality of right and opportunity to every one. Of course, there are compensations for the fact, but it is a fact.

The door of opportunity opens wider here than in any other nation in the world. The passion of the United States is that every one shall have his chance. We provide primary, secondary, and higher instruction, practically free of cost, to all. The teaching is efficient and the equipment is ample, often sumptuous. The spirit that supports it all is delightful. The school budget is the one tax of which no good American has the hardihood to complain. The road to and through and between the schools is a broad highway. It has no breaks and no very heavy grades. No sect, no party, no social set, no commercial interest, is allowed to obstruct it. So much is settled and everywhere accepted. It is more than settled and accepted. Wealth, society, business, religion and political sagacity find their security, and their pleasure in continually enlarging and strengthening the educational ideal.

The road to accomplishment, and to fame, is as open and as free as that to the schools. Education is not only the universal American passion, but hope, cheer, courage, are the words which the most beautiful and brilliant flag in the world whispers in the ears of all, native born or adopted, who live where it casts its shadow. A national temperament which is being warmed by the intermingling of the blood, the experiences, and the ideals of all the peoples of the world; which has been ennobled by the constantly enlarging opportunities and continually increasing influence of women; which has been incited by innumerable individual successes; and which has been made very confident if not very vain by the always unfolding magnificence of the governmental plan, is stirred to its very depths by the opportunities and the inspirations of the Amer-

ican Republic. The millions who are mature enough to feel it, and who have not been borne down by conditions which are well nigh insurmountable, are struggling, in season and out of season, to make the most of it. The spectacle is brilliant enough to stir the wonder, if not the jealousy, of the world. Nothing short of the *Gloria in excelsis* can express our heartfelt appreciation of it all.

Would that there were no word of qualification or ground for apprehension. But there is, and we are old enough and strong enough to look each other in the face and say it. Our general characterization expresses great and proud truths, and perhaps the larger part of the whole truth; but still it is only a part of the whole truth. The undisclosed part is that we count a mere opening for some as the equal chance for all. It is not so: one must be helped to a place where he may enter the door of opportunity, before he has any share in the equal chance for all. Leaving further applications of the principle to be made by others, it is my mission to this conference to say that all American children must be given the implements with which to make their way in our busy civilization, before it can be said that our political system is sufficiently efficient, or that equality of chance is held out to every one.

Fifty years ago we were discussing just such a question as this, and the great Lincoln, right here in the city of Chicago and the state of Illinois, was piercing the fallacy that political freedom covered the right to do wrong. Senator Douglas, a very great man, was saying that the territories should have free constitutions and be left to vote slavery up or down according to their inclinations; but the greatest of all Illinoisans and the greatest of all Americans, answered, "No, that is but temporizing with an inherent wrong." It would be logical, he said, if slavery were ever right; but for one man to claim the right to eat his bread in the sweat of another man's brow, save as the result of free contract or pursuant to bad laws already duly enacted, was essentially immoral. Slavery might be tolerated for a time where it was established by law, because even that might be better than a fratricidal war which might sever the union of the states and present an insuperable obstacle to a further democratic advance; but freedom was to be voted up and slavery must be voted down by the common action of a free nation, when it came to territory that was already free. The moral sense of the people saw the point, and used the man to carry the great principle to a consummation which saved the nation.

Slavery to ignorance is no less slavery than the slavery of a serf to an overlord. It is the inherent right of the American child to be or to become free from both. The possession of at least the elementary powers to read and write, by which he may gain knowledge and make the most of himself, is an essential part of his freedom. Such possession by all the people of a free country is the country's most valuable property. It is the property of all. Every one under a free constitution has just as much of a property interest in the literacy and the efficiency of every other as he has in the performance of any other legal or moral compact. No one can waive it for himself, through his youth or his ignorance, because of the mutuality of all the obligations of the universal compact. He can not lose it by misfortune for which he is not responsible. If he is incapable of asserting the right for himself, the legal organization set to enforce the terms of the compact is bound to enforce it for him. The right of every one to read is not to be voted up or down, as a city, a county, a district, or a parent may please to vote. This is essentially so in a democracy, and more particularly in a democracy with ideals like ours. The illiteracy of an American citizen whose childhood has been passed in America is unlawful and essentially immoral. Education, an essential of freedom, is always to be voted up and everywhere enforced in a republic.

These are not idle words. In America, where we offer more education to every citizen than does any other country in the world, there are more people who can not read or write in any language than there are in any other constitutional country in the world. The attendance upon the primary schools is less complete and regular than in any other well ordered nation upon the globe. In Chicago or New York there is a much larger percentage of people ten years old or more who can neither read nor write, than there is in London, or Paris, or Berlin, or Zurich, or Copenhagen, or even Tokio.

Illiteracy is almost a negligible quantity in the German Empire, in France, Switzerland, the Scandinavian countries, and even in Japan. As I was preparing this address I had the pleasure of a call from Dr Koht, professor of modern history in the University of Christiania. I asked him how many children there were in the Scandinavian countries, ten years old, who could neither read nor write. He said *not any*. He seemed surprised at the question. In the State of New York there are 55 in a thousand, and in Illinois 42 in a thousand.

It is easily explained. The immigration is an inadequate explanation. Immigrants from the highly or uniformly educated nations go far to offset those from the peoples where education is less diffused. Immigrants are often more jealous than native Americans of their opportunities in the schools. They commonly settle in the cities, where the schools are convenient and where all the people are accustomed to some measure of compulsion. There is a larger percentage of illiterate children of native born than of foreign born parents in the State of New York. This statement is also true of Illinois. There is often a larger percentage of illiteracy in the country than in the cities. The explanation is not a very complacent one. It is in the fact that we know little of national economics; that we have not acquired the habit of taking care, and particularly in the fact that we have a popular conception of freedom which does not include the vital necessity of proper restraint and compulsion as to all. It is because of our unfortunate disposition to let people do as they please, upon condition that they let us do as we please. It is because we are so indifferent in our self-confidence, so wilful, resourceful, and optimistic.

Probably no one will deny that we have as complete a system of school attendance and child labor laws in New York as in any state. They are not complete, but are measurably so for America. They are harmonious. The Labor and Education Departments are in accord. It looks as though the labor laws are very well enforced. Behind them there are strong, influential, and determined bodies of citizens—the labor organizations, who have direct interest in the execution of the laws which prescribe the ages, the hours, and all of the conditions where many people work together. These organizations not only enforce the laws but they create sentiment. Even the execution of the laws of itself makes sentiment. Direct interest gives energy and strength to the arm of the law. And even those people who have no direct interest, and who do not think much about it anyway, get in the habit of thinking that what happens all of the time ought to happen.

School attendance laws are without organized help. Sentiment is quite indifferent. Indeed, there is a not uncommon feeling that it is below the dignity of the State to be hunting up little children to make them go to school, and quite apart from the proper feelings of the well-to-do to be punishing poor or unworthy parents for not keeping their children in school. This feeling is much more common in the country and in smaller towns than in the larger

cities. But it exists everywhere. The officers of the law look upon the enforcement of school laws as beyond their realm. The police very nearly revolt against it. The local magistrates refuse to impose punishments. It is not strange; it is not wholly unworthy: they have sympathy, and they deal with so much squalor and with what seems to them so much more serious matters, that they are glad to take a promise and let the thing go: sometimes they are thinking about votes at the next election, but oftener they are simply expressing the very common feeling or indifference of the country. The execution of the school laws is largely left to school officers and, without the interested aid of the officers charged with the enforcement of the penal laws, the school officers are pretty nearly helpless. The mercury which measures American public sentiment upon enforcing school attendance is well down to the freezing point. Legislators dislike to add to the efficiency of attendance laws, and governors are even more reluctant to suggest discipline upon subordinate officers who persistently refuse to make them effective. In other words, we have the disadvantages as well as the advantages of democracy.

If our country were simply one great business corporation, with "no body to be kicked and no soul to be damned," which was expecting to continue indefinitely and was always looking for profits, its officers would do all they could to enlarge the efficiency of boys and girls, because they would know that such efficiency was the thing above all others to reinforce life and assure the repetition of dividends. If we had a king whom we sustained in the delusion or pretense that he was a sort of father to us all, he would be likely to adopt methods to enlarge our productivity, without letting any of us get out of what he conceived to be our proper places, because productivity would be translated into revenues. If our country were an empire, bounded by rival empires, and likely at any time to have to fight for territory and for life, things would be arranged to make each of us contribute to the military power of the empire. And intellectual acumen, versatility, craftsmanship, the working habit, are larger factors than mere physical strength in the constituent elements of military power. If our country were a constitutional monarchy, or even a republic where thought and political power were not very free; where there was an inherited autocracy and superimposed aristocracy, with a false "culture" which inbreeding was degrading into insipidity, every one of us would be used for what there was in us to hold up the props which support the roofs.

Our scheme of government is not like that of any other people. Our thinking and our outlook are peculiar to ourselves. We have shown that we can govern ourselves. We have shown that in infinite and overwhelming ways our plan is stable and secure enough, and our ways open the door of opportunity to the individual and the mass. The great heart of our nation is not yearning for aristocracy, or empire, or military power. It does not even want a kind or a measure of learning that is not in equilibrium and in sympathy with work. We want to bear a great nation's honorable and instructive part in the progress of the world. Beyond what good neighborliness and good morals impose, we do not wish to meddle with the affairs of other peoples. We do not wish them to do more concerning our affairs. As they do not seem so disposed, and as no one suspects that we would allow it if they did, there is no occasion to bluster about it. But in the interests of neighborliness and good morals we have some lessons to learn, as well as some to impart.

We do not believe in the government using the people, but we do believe in the people using the government. We would use this government for a double purpose — to keep us all in good legal and moral relations with all the world, and to assure peace, security, equality of right and the utmost of opportunity to every soul in the Republic. All that is inbred in us, but there is one thing that is not, and that is regard for common possessions and responsibility for the brother who is in bonds. It would of course be absurd to say that this is true of all of us, because those among us who have been the most successful in business have commonly become our noblest benefactors, and because vital occasions always develop a moral sense which may be counted upon; but it is not too much to say that, with all of our opportunities and all of our encouragement, there is no national policy and no national conscience in America which use the authority of the nation to universalize and conserve the efficiency of men and women.

We are a wasteful people. We have never studied economy. We have never acquired the habit of taking care. Other peoples would live sumptuously out of the difference between what they would get and what we do get out of our properties. We know nothing of the potentiality of our resources. When we fall short we start out to find new fields rather than to find ways for increasing the productivity of old fields. And, unhappily, loose habits react upon ourselves. They actually make us profligate of our boys and girls.

Just now we are enjoying a little breeze of prudence about natural resources. For once the statesmen and the orators and the magazines and the newspapers are *en rapport* with the professors of economics and the political economists generally, to make us more saving of wood and water and coal and oil and iron than we are. The agricultural colleges are telling us how to get more out of our lands, and admonishing us that if we don't treat them better and use more fertilizers they will stop yielding their fruits in season. We do more to conserve wild animals than tame ones. All the states are protecting moose and deer and fish and wild chickens. In New York we have taken up the cause of chipmunks and woodchucks, and would have done it for wolverines and gophers and badgers and prairie dogs if there were any. Such a wave of prudence is as exhilarating and encouraging as it is unprecedented and timely in America. When we get started in conserving we are likely to do a great deal of it. Surely we will not stop at the border line of human interest, and when the issue comes to be a moral one we will not forever hesitate at the point where it is necessary to compel people to do some things as well as not to do other things.

Resources alone can never provide the ballast necessary to the equipoise of a nation. The vital factors in a nation's existence, to say nothing of a nation's beneficence and moral progress, are human. In the economics of nation building, the overwhelming concern will have to be about boys and girls. In all history, men and women have overcome the scarcity of resources and the difficulties of situation. There are compensations in the economics of God. Strong and sane peoples have used slender resources and hard situations to work out overwhelming results. Unsubstantial and frivolous peoples have been overcome by the very plentitude of materials and the very advantage of situation. Great peoples have made themselves the greater by overcoming the hardness of situation. But no people has ever grown great unless tradition or the force of circumstances or intellectual prescience was larger than the material factors in the compounding of its future. Poverty or a sufficiency rather than inordinate wealth helps nations as well as individual men and women.

We are wealthy in natural resources. In woods and waters and mines we are a "millionaire" nation. We have no conception of the potential possibilities of our boundless areas of tillable lands, for we have never had to make the most of them. We hold a low estimate of the possibilities of domestic animals. We do not realize

the wealth that is yet in our mountains. We have even less appreciation of the associated worth of our hills and valleys and lowlands; of our lakes and streams and cascades; of the rains and dews that nourish us, and of the climate that stimulates us to make the most of material things. We have endless coasts washed by the two great oceans; deep, sheltered harbors in all latitudes; and the busy highways of the nations are and must ever be across the lands and waters that are under our flag.

But we have more than wealth of natural resources. History, tradition, severe fighting for freedom, the hard struggles of pioneers, much thinking, and strong moral purpose, have been the warp, as the wealth of a new continent has been the woof, of our civilization. There was something in the blood of our fathers; there is something in the blood which all the nations are continually sending to us; something in the compounding of the English nation, and something more in the compounding of the American nation; something in the factors which have produced, and something in the results which have grown out of, the steady advance of religious and political freedom through a thousand years, to make us a keen, quick, alert, and ambitious people. This in turn is disclosing our enormous natural wealth. It is also disclosing our cunning, our avarice, our pertinacity. Is our political system going to be equal to the new strains which the new situations put upon it? We have no doubt of it. But there is enough about it all to challenge the wisdom of the generation that is here, and to quicken the red blood of the one that is coming on.

"Conserving natural resources," if not an American phrase, has an American meaning. It describes a movement to stop a few great characters, through a few overpowering corporations to which we have delegated much of the power which belongs to all of us in common, from getting our common possessions into their own hands, or from despoiling great inheritances which have come to us in common. This does not necessarily mean anything against these great characters: most of us admire most of them. Often they are as great in their patriotism and in their rational generosity as in their business sagacity. It means nothing, necessarily, against the corporations. Their development of resources has been a necessary force in the development of a new country. It means merely that the time has come for a little more assertion of common rights in common property. It is more against a further absorption that is coming to amount to sequestration of our goods, than against a

national profligacy that has not yet put us in sore straits. The outcome of so much of "conservation" seems hopeful. Certainly it is grateful. But it is to be feared that greater prudence in the use of whatever goods each of us can lawfully gather will not seize upon us until we are in a tighter pinch than now.

And with all of our national wastefulness we are more profligate of childhood than of any other factor in the nation's life. We are not only lax about requiring attendance upon the schools, but we have pretty nearly given over the control and direction of children who live at home and exist in the regular order. The common authority presumes too much upon the proper exercise of the authority of parents. It does not take into account the number of parents who are so vicious or weak that they have no right to have children, or the number of unfortunate children who would be better off if they were orphans. And, largely through the influence of a sentimentalism that is fully half bad, the children in three quarters of the better homes and in the schools are given their own sweet way to an extent which weakens their characters for life.

And we can not exculpate the schools. They are as wasteful of child life as are the homes. From the bottom to the top of the American educational system we take little account of the time of the child. We are anxious to do everything under the sun, and to put into the young head of a child all that he is ever expected to know. The sentimental and well-meaning people load everything upon us. So we have eight or nine elementary grades for work which would be done in six if we were working for productivity and power. We have shaped our secondary schools so that they confuse the thinking of youth and break the equilibrium between education, and vocations, and people, and industries. And our university faculties divide up the time of students between their departments with as much enthusiasm as a young surgeon goes at an autopsy. The departments get what they must have to sustain themselves and the subjects get the consequences of it. They pay for it in time or in attenuated courses and unremunerated work. The training is for the professions, and if the universities are let alone the students will not be ready for life before they are thirty years of age. That keeps young people unmarried and unsettled too long, and it works havoc in life in obvious ways.

In the graded elementary schools of the State of New York less than half of the children remain to the end of the course. They do not start early enough. They do not

attend regularly enough. The course is too full of mere pedagogical method, exploitation, and illustration, if not of kinds and classes of work. The terms are too short, and the vacations too long. It all overworks and worries teachers so that to live at all they have to have short terms. More than half the children drop out by the time they are fourteen or fifteen, the limits of the compulsory attendance age, because the work of the schools is behind the age of the pupils and we do not teach them the things which lead them and their parents to think it will be worth their while to remain.

The compulsory attendance age should begin at six, or at seven at the most, and the course should be freed from everything not of fundamental importance to the early training of a child. I am not for going back to the simple work of a half century ago. I am quite aware of the fact that the child is to live in a complex civilization. But I am sure that there is no need to teach him, before he is fourteen years of age, everything that it may ever be well for him to know. I am quite sure that it is desirable to induce society to expend its devotion to culture upon the school grounds and the school-house, and leave the children to bathe in the sunlight of these things while the teachers are allowed to train them in the things they must know in order to be self-supporting and a support to the state. And I am no less sure that the multiplicity of books and appliances, and the endless exploitation and illustration in the teaching, may well be severely reduced. Anyway, it is not often a question of what or how it may be well to teach a child if the element of time is not to be considered: generally it is a question of what we can teach him before he is fourteen years old that will be of most worth to him in after years.

There is another side of this subject that is staring right at us. That is the unpreparedness of children for any vocation which is not literary or professional; the undue public and school influence upon ambitious temperaments to choose mental rather than manual work; and the utter indifference of the educational system in the past to the intellectual and industrial equilibrium of the country.

Now I am not saying or implying that a poor boy shall not enter a profession or aspire to any position in the land. That is for him to settle. The roads are to be open to every child no matter under what sort of a roof he is born. There is not only one road, but many; and he is not to be persuaded by always present injunctions and implications to enter one particular road when there is grave doubt about it being the best one for him. All the roads are to be

made good, and his all-around qualities are to be trained until he sees the road which seems the best to himself.

The finest successes come not so much from learning as from doing, and an educational system which does not recognize that fact and act up to it needs radical reforming. The conspicuous successes in life do not attend those who are the star students upon commencement morning, more than those who find something that they can do and who do it with all their might. I have been surprised at the number of college men who gain success, although for one reason or another they left college without a degree. The captains are those who can command. We have been trying to impose upon labor a leadership which was not accustomed to labor and did not know any too much about the details of labor. We have trained for culture and for expertness and for examinations. It is time to train for craftsmanship, and let *workmen* of character and efficiency forge to the front. They will do it anyway even though the signals are set against them, or else there will be little accomplishment and small progress. Why not arrange the scheme so as to make it easier for them to do it?

If we are to do anything substantial in the way of conserving American childhood, we shall have to control it; we shall have to insure its attendance upon instruction, and we shall have to train it to efficiency of hand even more than smartness of head. Character will come out of labor before competency will come out of mere culture of mind. How long shall we proceed upon the fundamental mistake that there is any culture worth the name which does not grow out of work, or any real manliness or womanliness which has not proceeded from things that have been done? I am not saying that, necessarily, the things done must have been done by the hand, but I do think that the culture is likely to be deeper and the character stronger if the things done have been done in the sweat of the brow.

We need a new order of public schools; a system on parallel lines with the literary high schools; a system which will train in hand work and which will not assume to train captains but workmen; a system which will permit no short cuts to the position of master workman, but will fit for that of journeyman in shorter time; a system which will stand fair between every interest of all the people; a system which will do definite things and open the door of opportunity to a multitude against whom it is now closed; and a system which will dignify hand labor and go a long way to restore

the balance that we have been losing, to the diminution of our efficiency and therefore of our happiness at home, as well as to the injury of our trade relations with the other nations of the world.

Of course the people whose feelings are expressed in this notable assemblage need no other argument than the exclusively moral one to quicken their interest in the conservation of American childhood. It has been the political assumption of the Republic that none other is necessary. But it must begin to be evident that even the economic interests of an empire, even the apprehensions and aspirations of the man on horseback, may go further than the moral sense of a democracy must necessarily go to make an elemental training of the children universal. Something beyond the open chance, and something beyond our encouragement and good wishes, will have to operate if we are to conserve the youth of the United States and steadily advance the efficiency, and therefore the character, the happiness, and the prosperity of the country. We shall have to have an always up-to-date enrolment of every child in the land, and some responsible central authority will have to see that every one gets that fundamental training in useful things, which, under the theories of all respectable governments, is his in his own right, and which the manifest interests of every country inexorably demand that he shall have.

As already observed, when we really commence a good thing we do much of it. President Roosevelt is following his notable movement for conserving natural resources with another, which is to have the attention of a distinguished conference in Washington next week, in the interests of neglected and defective children. That is admirable. It will be one of the many good things which will make the administration of Roosevelt prominent in the history of the country. But we must go still further. We must take up the claims of the overwhelming number of children who are reasonably normal and not very destitute. We must conserve their time, their mental and manual efficiency, and their morals. We must have them all recorded, and see that every one has the benefit of his birthright. We must exercise more control. We must see that every one is trained to read and write, and prepared for some vocation by which he can make a living. Then there will not be so many degenerates and waifs in the next generation or in the one after that.

There seems to be little room for issues of fact or differences of opinion among us. In college vocabulary, we offer to all the people

more wide-open electives in our educational system from top to bottom, and require less, than does any other country. They offer less and require more than we do. They certainly get more in a circumscribed but exact elementary training universally diffused than we do. We shall withdraw no offerings: we shall doubtless make more. But that is not enough. In the moral interests of boys and girls, in the interests of industrial prosperity, in the interests of the Republic, and in the interests of democracy and freedom in the world, we are bound not only to see that every child can read and write, but to follow him until he has the chance to enter upon a vocation which will make him respectable and of worth to the world.

In the advance of our educational system we have not maintained the balance. The unequal chance, the fallacious outlook, works injustice to multitudes of people and to many industries. Our education should put a premium upon work of hand. It is the only way to enlarge the open chance without confusing and misleading boys and girls.

We should all stand for laws establishing better and safer conditions for labor, and particularly for laws which try to keep greed from robbing children of their American birthright. But when we exclude children from work, we must include them in the schools. Too much work is bad, but too much idleness is infinitely worse. The schools are bound to be of a kind and character which will enable them to count organized labor among their strongest supports.

We are in the midst of a great task. We are working out the basis and the details of the greatest industrial democracy in human history. Let us lose nothing of our good humor. Let us abate nothing of our confidence and our courage. Let us prove that our indifference is more apparent than real. Let us tone down our conceits and our boasting. Let us cultivate toleration of opinion and be generous in our estimates. Let us think straight, with an open mind, expecting to give and take and come to common conclusions. Let us use our political power without fear, when with good purpose. Let us say nothing for mere novelty; nothing to catch the eye of a newspaper which scares itself for revenue only. Let us go on getting harder and stronger, exercising more and more control in the interests of decency and thrift, and making the forces of righteousness more aggressive than the forces of evil dare to be.

There is no need of misgivings. What is upon us was bound to come. We should have expected it, and we can handle it. When

the moral sense of the nation is once stirred it acts quickly and forcefully. A democracy with the finest possibilities for every one is better than a monarchy which, in one way or another, keeps a whole people in bondage. Of course, there are difficulties. It is harder for a people to agree together and execute their purpose, than for a monarch or minister who reckons not with the popular mind to settle things. But even old Talleyrand declared that public opinion was mightier than any monarch who ever lived. We have broken out roads and we will break out more. We will consider until we conclude what ought to be done, and then we shall not be so squeamish about vesting executive officers with the power to carry it out. Our plan of government has already justified its being. It will do so more completely. And when it has solved our problems upon a basis of reason and of right, as it will, the people will be the happier and the State the stronger, because in our education we shall be better balanced, in our industries we shall be more efficient, and in our politics and our religion we shall be more free.

LINCOLN CENTENARY

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

NO man has expressed the feelings of America so well as President Lincoln; and no man in this or any other land has been more truly great. He was the child of poor parents. He was born in a log cabin. He went to school but little because he lived where there were no schools. When a boy and young man he worked hard with his hands and it gave him a healthy body. He studied a few good books and it gave him a clear head. He liked history. He mastered mathematics and did surveying. He was interested in politics, and his mind grasped the laws easily. He read about the principles of government, and thought about the rights of men. He became a lawyer. He was elected to the Legislature of Illinois, and then to the Congress of the United States. The experiences thus gained helped to make him a successful lawyer. He was much interested in the affairs of the people, in universal justice, and in the good of his country. He thought for himself, and he thought hard and straight. He had a keen sense of humor and a fine gift of wit. He wrote so plainly, and he spoke in public so clearly, that all the people could understand him. But he had even greater qualities. His habits were simple and he lived without great show. He was true and sincere, and the people believed in him. All these things made him a leader, a statesman, and a very great man. The country was deeply agitated about slavery. It had existed in all of the states in earlier years; and it then existed in all of the Southern States, where there were five millions of slaves. He abhorred human bondage, but he abhorred war also. The laws allowed

From the Lincoln Centenary pamphlet, issued by the State Education Department, for February 12, 1909

slavery in the South, and he thought it impossible to change the laws and abolish slavery without bringing on a war between the Northern and the Southern States. He hoped for an easier and better way. But many tried to carry slavery into the new states and territories that were being formed beyond the Mississippi river. He was opposed to that, whether war came or not. He spoke hundreds of times against it, and what he said made him President of the United States. This brought on a dreadful war, which lasted four years. Great armies of citizens were organized to save the Union. Half a million of the best men in the country, North and South, lost their lives. There was sorrow in nearly every family, and distress in almost every home. In the midst of the war President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, freeing all the slaves. It was the greatest act of a great and noble President, who was right in his reasoning, clear in his statements, courageous in his acts, and humane in his treatment of all upon whom the war brought misfortune. He thought little of himself. He wanted, above all things, to save the Union. He was very happy when he came to believe that he could make the nation wholly free and save the Union at the same time. Guided by God, in whom he believed, he led the forces of Freedom and Union to a splendid national triumph; and all, including the people of the South, are now glad of it. The abolition of slavery brought freedom to all who live under the flag of the Union, and opened the way for us to become a more united and a very much greater nation. Just as the war ended, when President Lincoln was fifty-six years old, he was assassinated, and all the people mourned as never before or since. His life was the best expression we have ever had of the humanity, the industry, the sense, the conscience, the freedom, the justice, the progress, the unity, and the destiny of the Nation. His memory is our best human inspiration.

WHAT MAKES LINCOLN GREAT

ADDRESS AT THE CELEBRATION OF THE CENTENARY OF THE BIRTH OF
ABRAHAM LINCOLN, HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE CITY OF
NEW YORK, AT THE GREAT HALL OF THE COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF
NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 12, 1909

From the close of the Revolution to the crisis of the Civil War slavery was the ever present obstacle to the union of the states. It was not a live question until union was possible and necessary. The mother country had approved slavery, and all the colonies had participated in it. It had vanished in the North because not right and not profitable, and it had become established in the South because all the conditions favored it and the moral sense did not disapprove it. The South was rich in property and weak in numbers, and the North was strong in people and poor in pocket. And the South was not lacking in moral sensibilities. Society was quite as highly developed and religion quite as much a force in the Carolinas as in New England. All the colonies had planned and fought together for independence, and all had done much that was vital for the Union. But slavery obstructed the formation of a Union that could live; it menaced the constitutional convention almost to the point of dissolution; it threatened to destroy the Union after it had been created.

The "more perfect union" was the result of a necessity that was absolute. The constitution was the splendid creation of educated and sagacious statesmanship, of superior patriotism, and of proper concessions to situations and opinions. In all this the North and the South had equal share. The recognition of slavery and the express protection of the foreign slave trade for twenty years was the heavy price which had to be paid for the constitution itself. Heavy as it was, it was well to pay it, and there is no ground for recrimination about it now. All the states agreed to the rendition of slaves, to the counting of slaves on the basis of representation, and to a tax upon slaves imported. For the protection of the slave trade, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut voted with Maryland, the two Carolinas, and Georgia, while Virginia voted against it. The lives of states, like the lives of men, have their inconsistencies. When the adoption of the constitution had been wrested from reluctant states, the bondage of men and women, within circumscribed limits, became legalized in the Republic which was being dedicated to the principle that all men stand equal before the law.

Then commenced the long and acrimonious struggle for the admission of slavery into common territory and into new states. Communication was slow and contacts were few. The sections came together but little, either directly or through the press. There were large accessions of territory and other great states were coming into view. Washington was the arena in which freedom and slavery battled for their own. Learning and oratory were the instruments of each. But slavery was more aggressive because the more directly concerned. War was frequently threatened, and once employed. The Union was at all times in danger. Compromise followed compromise. From each conflict slavery emerged with the advantage upon her side. At the turning point of the last century the hope of the makers of the constitution had not been realized. Freedom was more crippled and humiliated; slavery was more aggressive and defiant. The nation was not becoming wholly free. It was apparently becoming wholly slave.

The constitution prohibited Congress from legislating against the slave trade until 1808. In the next year, in a hovel in the Kentucky wilderness, a man child was born. It is lacking nothing in reverence to say that he was to be "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," or that he was to "deliver his people from an overwhelming sin." He came to his full stature at the turning point of the century, just as the freedom of his country stood most vitally in need of a prophet and a knight.

Abraham Lincoln was surely a child of those whom, with apt discrimination, he called the "plain people." The study of his genealogy may fascinate students, but his ancestry is not material to his memory. His forefathers are interesting to us because he is interesting to us, but they can neither help nor harm his fame. The little child who appeared in the log cabin a hundred years ago, was fifty-six years later carried to his burial amid profound and universal mourning. That is the ground of his rights to greatness in America. His life was great. He had a noble mission in the world and nobly he fulfilled it. It was but well begun when death overtook him. His memory looms greater with every passing year. His life was the finest expression we have of the best attributes of American character, and his memory is our highest inspiration to be plain, sane, true, tolerant, patient, aggressive, and hopeful, as a nation.

In preëminent degree he was the embodiment of the homely virtues. He lived plainly and soberly. He refused to overreach and he met all of his personal obligations. He was a good neighbor

and a firm friend. He discouraged unprofitable controversy. He tried his lawsuits without embittering his adversaries. He helped the ward, the town, the county, and the state, in which he lived. He had wit and humor. He could tell an apt story and make a good speech. Admirable as these qualities were, they were in themselves only enough to save him from mediocrity and lift him into respectability. Genius may win fame without them. Though noble and perhaps necessary contributions to real greatness, other qualities must supplement the common virtues before greatness is attained.

If Lincoln had not an orderly and legal mind by nature, it was early and easily made so by youthful study of a few of the books which could give it texture and vitality. The mathematics which he loved made it click with exactness. He laid a boy's firm grasp upon the fundamentals of the law — its history, its philosophy, its spirit, its purposes, and its methods. Decisions were only incidents. He reasoned from the groundwork of society up to the matter in hand. His purposes were sound and his logic inexorable. He was successful. He tried more cases at the Circuit, and argued more appeals in the Supreme Court, than any other man in Illinois. This contributed to, but it did not reach the height of his greatness.

Much, but not too much, has been made of his activity in politics. He looked after the political organization. He saw to it that the delegates were to his liking. He did much thinking for the conventions. He husbanded the patronage and used it. He joined issues and wrote platforms. He led his party, and laid intellectual pitfalls and political ambushes for his adversaries. He was often a candidate for office, was often chosen, and often beaten. He spent weeks and months together "preaching the gospel" and "cultivating the vineyard" from Galena to Cairo. But he derived no commercial profit from politics. Rather, he contributed much more than his share. He was always poor. Frequently he left politics and returned to the law to earn a living. He never seems to us — nor was he, in fact — a mere office seeker. He never depended upon place. He never dissipated in politics. He was in public life for a purpose. He absolved himself from all political activity for years together when he saw no principles at stake, nor new ground to be gained. He cared nothing for ward, city, or county places. Statecraft fascinated him. He thought deeply. He had a surprisingly clear outlook. He was concerned about the rights of men and about a government that could endure. He knew the people, for he was one of them; and he spoke so plainly and convincingly that he gained a following. We now know that he had become a

statesman, and we now see that his politics was but a mere incident to his statesmanship. Some of the elements of his real greatness began to appear, as his activity in politics was an accessory to it; but rustling in politics was far, very far, from the summit of it.

It is not to be denied that he was fortunate in his opportunity. Manifestly he did not think so. Few other men would have thought so. The man who thought only of that at the time would have missed the opportunity. But looking backward we see it. Stephen A. Douglas was a great man. History will not deny his patriotism or his statesmanship. He was the foremost political orator of his time, until he met Lincoln in joint debate. If he then ceased to be, it was because Lincoln had the qualities which could make the most of his freer opportunities and the better cause. Douglas was not only a senatorial star of the first magnitude, but he was unquestionably the recognized leader of the great political party which had been dominant in the country since that fateful morning when, at the break of day, Adams started off for Massachusetts in a pet which refused to let him induct Jefferson into the great office for which the senator was supremely ambitious and which it was the common expectation that he would reach. Illinois was a democratic state. Illinois was the political "borough" of Douglas, and political arts had been employed to set the lines so that he could hold it against any popular majority which a passing storm might throw up against him. To contest the political position, and the very political life, of Senator Douglas, among a people who had long considered him their greatest man, could not have seemed an enviable opportunity to Lincoln.

But something beyond our ken rules great events, and that something, without his knowing it, made it Lincoln's opportunity. The repeal of the "Compromises" opened up the slavery question anew and with unprecedented fury. More than once Lincoln had shown his independence of party in the interest of the freedom of black men, but his veneration for the constitution and the laws kept him from abolitionism. Abhorring slavery with all his great soul, he abhorred war also. He knew, above almost every other man, that **slavery was intrenched in law**; that an invasion of territory or a violation of the compacts of the constitution, to free the slaves, would force a war which might not remove the evil, and which might sever the union of the states and obstruct the advance of democracy in the world. He grasped a vain hope in the unexpected. Before the extreme of overt war, slavery might be rooted out by a tidal wave of feeling, or restricted by negotiation. The

slaves might be paid for by the government and set free. And if war were to come, there was nothing more important than that it should not come before the nation could sustain it, and that even then it should be a war of the slave power against the Union, rather than a war of freedom against an institution which was sanctioned by long usage and supported by the fundamental law.

The people were dazed by the menace of a cataclysm. Parties were disintegrating and a new alignment was at hand. The Whig party was at an end. The Democratic party was dividing; the Democratic national leader and the Democratic president had parted company. The Republican party was beginning to show some coherency, but was without aggressive organization. Some of the men who were yet to lead it were playing small politics with one faction or the other of the opposition. At this juncture Senator Douglas devised the doctrine that the new states should settle the slavery question for themselves; that it should be held to be a local and not a national question; that each state should vote slavery up or down as the majority saw fit. It was a specious doctrine, and upon it the great senator went back to Illinois to seek a reelection to the Senate.

Lincoln joined the issue. A voice that was familiar to Illinois now began to be heard by the nation. It was heard because it had something to say, and because Senator Douglas was obliged to reply to it. It said that a house divided against itself could not stand; that the nation would become all slave or all free; that whereas there had been reason to expect it would become all free, there was now extreme danger that it would become all slave; that the natural state of the country was one of freedom; that if there were reasons why slavery should be endured in old slave territory, there was no reason why it should be allowed to come into territory already and inherently free; that slavery was a moral wrong and no majority could make it right; and that the power to vote the slave system into free territory was never to be upheld and never to be conferred by a free people.

It was the greatest political debate in our history. It was carried to every part of the state. It raged from July to November. There were hundreds of meetings, and seven of them in representative centers of the state were joint, and attended by vast multitudes. At the onset the senator alluded to his adversary as a "kind, amiable, intelligent gentleman," but such patronizing pleasantry soon ceased, for ample cause. There was much sparring for position,

great parades and much noise and clatter, plenty of humor and assumed politeness, no dearth of invective, and no lack of seriousness and ardor. Lincoln was a lance so free that not even his friends could limit or direct him, and very often his thrusts reached a vital part. If he had the stronger moral argument, he was no less equipped in legal learning, and he kept the better natured. Without apparent thought of self, he did a master's work upon the ship of state. When the election came, the Legislature was with Douglas, but the popular majority was with Lincoln. He had, fortunately, lost the senatorship; but he had come to be the available candidate of a rapidly consolidating party for the presidency. And he had shown the intellectual virility and the moral courage which did so much to make him great.

The election of Lincoln made war inevitable. He knew this better than any other man in the country. The men of the South expected secession, because they anticipated Lincoln's election and quickly realized the meaning of it. Before the election was held they began to assemble the machinery of separation and independence, and the moment the result was reached they started it with all celerity. Before the inauguration, seven states had formally assumed to go out of the Union. Their natural rectitude, their consistent thinking, and their pride, left no other course open to the statesmen of the South. But they had no reason to count upon a sanguinary war. They had reason enough to think that the North would not accept the gauge of battle. Some of the strongest friends of freedom and union were advising that they be allowed to depart in peace. In the election the North had spoken, but the South did not know the North, and the South looked upon Lincoln as a mere lawyer and politician. No better did the North know the South. Nor did the North know itself. Neither realized the conscientiousness, the caliber, or the heroism of the other. Indeed, neither knew the fighting qualities that were within itself. When the dogs of war were once let loose all the packs were eager enough, but before the chase was really on neither side knew its own strength, and each underestimated the resources and the spirit of the other. No one, North or South, unless it were Lincoln, suspected that such a war was close at hand.

But Lincoln knew both peoples — the people of the North and the people of the South — as well as did any living man. By birth and knowledge of the situations and temperament of the people of the South, he was almost as much a southern man as the President of

the Southern Confederacy himself. When war came his family relatives and friends were in both armies. He was at the center of information, and a keen student of the rights, the logic, and the advantages of situations. He knew also about the things in the constitution which protected slavery in the slave states. He knew about all the other things in the constitution. He regarded all parts of the constitution. He understood, moreover, the powers and the responsibilities of the presidential office. He knew the sacred character of the Union. He believed there could be no union with slavery. He believed there could be no liberty without union. It was not more a matter of opinion than of fervor; not so much a matter of policy as of conscience. He knew the terms of the oath he was to take. That oath was as inviolable as the Bible upon which it was taken. That constitution and that oath meant that the government revenues were to be collected in every port, and the government mails were to go unhindered upon every highway. The rights of men, the legal system, the temples of freedom, established by the armies of Washington, were to be upheld. Nothing but the inability to maintain the Union by supreme physical effort could determine that the Union was without the power to maintain itself. Of all men, Lincoln knew that war was at hand. His knowledge of the fact and the reasons which made the fact inevitable were among the elements which made him great.

It was a serious, weird, prophetic figure that moved slowly out of the pioneer West to the helm of state. He spoke many times, but he said he was not ready to speak: he declared that he was anxious to hear, but that when the time came he would speak with no uncertain sound. He did so speak. He spoke in an English style so pure that it has become distinctive wherever English is upon the tongues of men. He spoke in sorrow and with affection. He spoke with all caution and yet with all distinctness. He left no room for doubt. He put the burden of the war upon those who in unhappy passion would paralyze the laws and sever the Union. Arguing that "no state upon its own mere motion can lawfully get out of the Union," and that "resolves or ordinances to that effect are legally void; and acts of violence against the authority of the United States are insurrectionary or revolutionary," he declared with all solemnity that he would execute the laws; that there need be no bloodshed and would be none unless forced upon the national authority; and just as the last moment came he took the inaugural address upon his

knee, and in genuine affection added, "In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow-countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The government will not assail you. You have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy it, while I shall have a solemn one to protect, preserve, and defend it." But there was no other way. War had to be. Nothing less than the magnificent repulse of the heroic charge of Pickett's division at Gettysburg could settle the question.

Lincoln could lay the field of diplomacy and arrange the plan of war, as well as the groundwork of legal or political discussion. Much more, this sagacious and gentle knight of the forum and the hustings proved at once that he could be the very reservoir of power, the very genius of administration, the very incarnation of war. Without much reverence for form, without any false worship of precedent, he used practical ways to accomplish practical ends. Quickly he rose above the commonplace. He would attend to little things when beseeched, but his mind sought the great things. There were great men in Congress, but he led them. There were very great men, who were very unlike, in the Cabinet, but he dominated their every important act. He hesitated not a moment in determining the foreign relations of the government. But of course the vital concerns were at his hand. He coaxed and coerced and held the states that were upon the border line of conflict. He was always kind and always stern. The sufferings of a soldier, or the grief of a woman unnerved him, but he lacked nothing in steadiness or strength when it came to using the resources of the country for the saving of the Union. With a great heart which brooded over the agonies of conflict, he gathered all the forces and sharpened all the instruments of war. He knew the temper of soldiers who were American freemen. He was impatient at inaction. He lost no opportunity to aid a private soldier or inspire an army. He gave all the credit and the glory to a general who won victories, and he visited his grieved and stinging censure upon one who refused the opportunity of battle after a success in the fear of loss of personal and professional prestige. He would hold a general's horse, or remove him from command, if he thought that the one thing or the other would bring another victory. When success came, he made it the base of broader undertakings which could not be attempted without it. If disaster overtook the Union arms, as it often did, he stood with bowed head and bleeding heart, but still dauntless, in its awful presence. He effaced himself completely and, partizan

though he was, he rose above all partizanship. He proposed to give over his place to the political opposition if that would more completely unify the North, but when it would not, and he had to fight for reelection, he did it with his old-time sagacity. The result proved that he above any other could unify the North. And the consolidating sentiment of the North carried the awful struggle to its consummation. Manassas, Antietam, Shiloh, Chickamauga, Vicksburg, Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, the Wilderness, are some of the names that exemplify the vicissitudes of the long struggle and express the gallantry of Americans, North and South. When the white light of peace broke at Appomattox it lighted a Union that would need time for convalescence, but was free enough to live: and the lifting clouds revealed something of the enduring proportions of Lincoln.

War changed the legal status of slavery. States could not both repudiate and invoke the constitution. The slave system could not claim protection from a government whose very life it was seeking to undo. Property is the lawful prize of war. It is singularly so when the property is in slaves who are made to add human energy to the inert forces of war. The first flash at Sumter changed the legal situation. Accommodation was possible no longer. Slavery or the Union was to die. New laws were to come right speedily. The goddess of justice, which had always protected the master, made ready to help the slave. If the Union were to live, the falling of the sword which would shatter the shackles and set men and women free had come to be a question of strength and of events. Happily, the man who had so fondly wished that "all men everywhere might be free" was to determine when the powers of the commander in chief, and the physical strength of the army and navy of the United States, made it both possible and expedient to set men free.

Patriots and moralists could see no room for hesitation. The North was divided. The war drew heavily upon its resources. There was mourning in every home. The result was far from certain. Success depended upon sentiment. The border states were always in the balance. With those who urged the moral rights of man were the many who insisted that the President should find express authority for all he did in the constitution and the laws which had never anticipated such a crisis, and those others in overwhelming numbers who demanded that a war for the Union should never be changed into a war for abolition. Old friends left him. The blind-

ing storm raged all about him, and the rolling waves of bitterness and abuse broke at his very feet. With the proclamation in his own handwriting in his private desk, known to none but himself and his God, he was the fortress of the situation. "What I do or leave undone about slavery, I do or I abstain from doing to save the Union." The Union was the only temple upon which Liberty could rest her foot. In his waiting, as in his doing, he exemplified the qualities which make him great.

The supreme satisfaction in Lincoln's life must have come when he could believe that emancipation would give added strength to the armies and help save the Union. None knew better than he that it meant more to the white man than to the black. If it gave the one his chance, it saved the other from his sin. If it freed a race, it freed a nation also. If it gave a race its physical freedom, it gave the nation its moral opportunity. It made possible such a unity of the Republic as had never been, and it opened the way for an outworking of democracy in industry, in politics, in education, and in religion, which is the marvel of the world, and which projects its light and its power into the obscure recesses of the coming ages.

It would be a frightful perversion of this hundredth anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln if a word should be spoken which is out of key with the spirit of the man. In the very midst of war he had no words but those of considerateness and kindness for the people of the South. Only two months before he died he tried without avail to convert his Cabinet to compensation for the slaves. In his great second inaugural he declared the national, rather than the sectional, responsibility for slavery. A week before he died he walked up the streets of Richmond with "Tad's" hand in his, and went around the block to call at the home of General Pickett, who led the awful charge at Gettysburg. Mrs Pickett opened the door, with a baby in her arms. "I am Abraham Lincoln," he said. "Oh! you are the President," the surprised woman answered. "No, I am George Pickett's old friend from Illinois." Then he took the baby in his arms and kissed it. This restored the Union at one point at least. He expressly informed the War Department and the generals in the field that they must not assume to settle any political questions. He was, and he intended to be, the best friend the South could have, and its overwhelming misfortune came in his melancholy death. Yet we must not dare to forget that more than generosity was in his soul. Justice, as well

as gentleness; sternness, as well as magnanimity; "faith in the right," as well as "charity for all"; greatness, as well as generosity, were all his. The occasions determined the applications. Through it all, he left no rough word and no mean act to degrade the great things he did. In what he said, in what he did, in what he forebore, appear the qualities which make him great.

Forty-four years have come and gone since Lincoln died. There were great men and great leaders before him, and there have been great men and great leaders since him. Another generation is here. It is a free and a discriminating generation. It ranks him above all others. He is one of us, the child of American opportunity. He has given the truest ring and the sweetest harmony to the spirit of his country. No man, no combination of men, could change it: the spirit of the nation is attuned to the spirit of Lincoln, and so it will remain forever. That is the overwhelming thing which makes Lincoln great.

There is one star in the heavens which men know before all the other stars. Taken by itself alone, it is an ordinary star among the stars. It is not of the first magnitude: yet it is in good company. It is one of a brilliant constellation which always attracts the eye. It has supreme importance in itself, for it is so near the polar axis of the earth that the world and all the stars seem to swing around it. It is always in sight in the United States. Its fixedness and stability make it the guide and the helper of practical men. The magnetic needles point to it. On land or sea, the traveler looks to it and feels sure upon his course. What the north star is to the natural life of the world, Lincoln is to the political science of the Republic and the moral sense of men.

Do any of us think that it was a matter of chance? Then we think that day and night, the rains and the dew, the winds and the tides, the fertility of the earth, the crops in their seasons, the colors and the fragrance of the flowers, magnetism and electricity, the sun and the stars, are matters of chance.

It was in the divine plan, and not the mere accident of chance. The God who put the north star in the heavens made Lincoln. The God of the Bible and of the creation, the God of the Hebrew prophets and of the Christians, the God of the unfolding centuries, the God who has helped freedom in all ages and in all lands, the God who gave wisdom to the men of the Constitutional Convention and victory to the arms of the Union at Gettysburg — He made Lincoln great. And in the plentitude of His powers, and in the outworking of His plans, He makes Lincoln greater and greater, year by year.

THE MORAL ADVANCES IN LINCOLN'S POLITICAL CAREER

ADDRESS AT THE SERVICE HELD IN OBSERVANCE OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN, AT THE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, ALBANY, N. Y., SUNDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 14, 1909

Next Friday it will be eight and forty years since Abraham Lincoln was the guest of this State and of this city. He was the president elect. He was on a journey which has become historic. He was going to a place which was already great, but which he was to make very much greater in human history. The schools were closed, and I saw him emerge from the train where the railroad crosses north Broadway, kept abreast of his carriage upon the slow march down Broadway and up State street to the old Capitol, and heard his brief address from the porch, beyond which boys of twelve, who were without influence, very properly were not allowed to go.

His was an unusual figure. His extreme height was accentuated by his leanness and by a silk hat which was tall and straight like its owner. Yet there was nothing odd, nothing amusing, nothing ungainly, in the appearance of the man. He was the child of western pioneers, and a pioneer of pioneers himself, but in figure, face and dress he would have looked very much at home in a Congregational church in New England. He was sinewy, strong, and stalwart — the figure of an athlete, for an artist. He could take an axe by the end of the helve and hold it straight, with his arm upon a line with his shoulder. In the state convention which determined to present him for the presidency, some enthusiasts from his early country home brought in some walnut rails which they said he had split, and the convention undertook to have him say whether or not that were so. He answered that there was no way of identifying those particular rails, but he could say in truth that he had split a great many that were just as good. He was always at his ease on horseback. Coming up our Capitol hill over the cobblestone pavement, he stood erect, true, and imposing in his jolting carriage, and removed his tall hat to the cheering crowds upon either side, with a grace that was a part of the absolute naturalness and genuineness of the man. Too much has been said about his awkwardness and his forbidding dress. There was no more sham-

ble in his gait than in his mind or in his morals. He sometimes wore a shawl, but the shawl was an article of men's street apparel in his day. His dress was as unconventional as the man was original and independent. But there was nothing extreme, certainly nothing freakish, about it all. The physical man, and his dress, and his stalwart character, and his sane and independent thinking went together, and together they fitted into the body of the people of whom he was one, while they seemed appropriate enough to the great station which he was called upon to fill.

He was then fifty-two years old. He was born in a cabin in the western wilderness, of a father who never succeeded, and of a mother who had some of the blood and many of the traits of gentleness. He has said that his childhood could all be expressed by the one line in Grey's *Elegy* which speaks of "The short and simple annals of the poor." In youth he was accustomed to severe labor of the hand. He worked in a store and became a leader in the badinage of the neighborhood. At odd moments he read the Bible and Shakespeare many times, and studied Euclid until he had mastered the demonstrations. He became fascinated with the structure of society and with the sources, the forces, the history, the philosophy, and the applications of the law. He had enough to say. He developed a pure, a distinct, and now a well known English style in which to say it. He wrote with all clearness. He spoke with great distinctness. He came to be the foremost lawyer in his state. He came to make as well as to interpret and apply the law. Politics went with the law, and he attracted, managed, and marshaled men. With on-rushing events he became the great war-president of the United States, the great emancipator of the American Republic.

We have no need to dwell upon the external or physical characteristics of this man, for we all know them by heart. But we may well reflect upon the more striking advances of the steadily unfolding moral character which was the soul of Abraham Lincoln, and which gave initiative, direction, and always increasing power to all that he did.

It is one of the elements of his greatness, and one of the satisfactions of his country, that he never lacked in moral character. From first to last he did nothing to bring shame, and said nothing to be taken back. To the conventional he seems unconventional. In childhood, in youth, in manhood, he lived upon the border line between broken and unbroken territory. It is the compensation of

primitive life that it is broad and free. Lincoln was a veritable child of nature. He was a product of the wilderness, and of the prairie, and of society in its liquid state. But he was the heir of the opportunities, as well as of the hindrances, of open situations. He knew both the external and the hidden life of a wondrous people. He was disposed to be like his people. He did not think there was anything very unusual about himself. He was not a radical. He was much censured for it. He was not a conservative. He was much censured for that. He aspired to be an ordinary leader of an ordinary people. He was a practical man of affairs and he used practical means to practical ends. He was part and parcel of the manner of life of his people. His ways were severely plain. He would change places with the humblest. He drew his illustrations from situations and incidents which all could understand. He would have seemed out of place, and perhaps occasions came when he did seem out of place, in the midst of a culture which some one has described as mere lassitude refined. But he was at home wherever there was virile thinking that bore upon the actualities of life. If one knew him only superficially he might seem inconsistent. He was gentle and severe, kind and stern, cautious and aggressive, humorous and melancholy, modest and mighty. From first to last he effaced himself. Within the limitations of the law he venerated, he listened to the great heart which told him what to do. He gained the confidence of his people because, through a life that was full of menace, his personal morals remained unscathed. Love of truth and of justice was the paramount quality in his character, from the wilderness in Kentucky to the presidency. He was always in a struggle, and the struggling gave him strength. Abuse, of which he received more than his share, disciplined but did not embitter him. He towered higher and higher because he attached no undue importance to individuals or to episodes; because he broke through barriers and gained strength by it; because he accomplished things, and mounted upon results to accomplish things that were higher than what had gone before.

His nature was not merely moral. It was religious. His life was moved by something more than a mind which recognized the needs of sane and decent living, and the obligations of men to men. His was a nature which without ostentation expressed its religious feeling. He did not parade, but he did not hide, his feeling. God moved in the life of Lincoln. He did not suppress God in his nature, but made himself the instrument of God's freedom, oppor-

tunity, and effectiveness. From first to last he spoke of this. He spoke of it more commonly to his close friends and in the writings which he did not expect the world to see. But he never withheld the expression when the situation made it seemly and the occasion was serious enough to keep it from being misunderstood.

And with Lincoln religion was not an occasional sentiment. It was not an ecstatic state. It was not an empty form. It was not even a thing satisfied and concluded by membership in a Christian church. It was not alone a thing which made him a devoted husband, and a loving father, and an efficient townsman. It was God in a great mind and in an heroic man. It did not keep him from the affairs of men. It did not narrow him. It never made him exclusive. It did not close his eyes to the realities of life and the attributes of men. It plunged him into struggles. It kept him straight and gave him power in the Legislature, at the hustings, and upon the Illinois circuit. The outworking of it in the places which really try out the souls of men gave him the texture and the fiber and the superb moral and patriotic purpose which could rescue his country, and perhaps self-government in all countries, from what appeared to be insuperable obstacles and opposition. It is that outworking, and that alone, which, in a single generation, has taken Lincoln out of all partizanship and made him a proper theme for our reflections at the regular service of a Christian church.

But all true men grow strong and great not by bounds, but by steps. They grow greater and greater by reason of the greater and greater things done. Let us find some of the particular steps, some of the things done, by which the moral nature of Lincoln grew to such heroic size and such splendid strength.

The Illinois Legislature in 1837, following the ordinary thinking of the times, resolved that "the right of property in slaves is sacred to the slave-holding states." It was twenty-four years before the Civil War. It was a commonplace deduction from the federal Constitution and the laws of Congress and of the states, which was accepted by all save the few ultra and impractical people—the very salt of the earth—who were for abolition without regard for such human things as laws and constitutions. Lincoln, then a member of the State Legislature, was not an abolitionist. He knew about the legal basis and structure of society, and he venerated the Constitution and the laws. That makes it the nobler still that the mere boy of twenty-eight revolted. He opposed, but his opposition was unavailing. Ordinary men would not have felt called upon to

go beyond the bounds of ordinary opposition. But despite his own estimate, he was not an ordinary man. He prepared his personal protest in writing, declared that "slavery is founded on both injustice and bad policy," procured his colleague from Sangamon county, in which is the city of Springfield, to sign it with him, and required the House to express this protest upon its journal. It was heroic because it invaded a common usage and an accepted doctrine, and struck a note to which no party had dared listen, and at which no lawyer and no leader of opinion had dared strike. We now see what a significant step it was, and we ought to see how it aided harder and longer steps.

With an always growing practice of the law, and an always enlarging leadership in politics, in ten years more Lincoln was a member of the thirtieth Congress. It embraced a galaxy of great men. Webster, Calhoun, Benton, Cass, Corwin, Collamer, Sam Houston, Simon Cameron, Robert C. Winthrop, Hannibal Hamlin, Horace Greeley, John A. Dix, Jefferson Davis, Alexander H. Stephens, Robert Toombs, and Andrew Johnson, were there. Stephen A. Douglas was promoted from the House to the Senate the day Lincoln entered the House. It was a congress of great events, as well as of great men. Liberty and slavery were in an overt and paroxysmal struggle. The only unholy war in our history, that with Mexico for more slave territory, was on.

Ordinary new members at thirty-eight would have been restrained in such a presence and in the midst of such events. But the protest in the Illinois Legislature made further protests easier. Lincoln's conscience told him that it was an aggressive war of the slave power for more territory in the Southwest to offset the opening and enlarging free territory of the Northwest. The President, who had permitted and helped the war, contended that Mexico had invaded our territory and shed our blood. In thirty days after entering the House, Lincoln broke through a line of great men and through forbidding situations, and offered carefully prepared resolutions in which it was demanded that the President indicate the *spot* within American territory where the first blood had been shed, and he addressed the House at length in support of his demand. Let us recall what the fledgling in Congress could say to the President of the United States: "Let the President" he said, "answer the interrogatories I propose, fully, fairly, candidly, with facts and not with arguments. Let him remember that he sits where Washington sat, and let him answer as Washington would answer. As

a nation should not, and the Almighty will not, be evaded, so let him attempt no equivocation. If, so answering, he can show that the soil was ours where the first blood of the war was shed, I am with him for his justification." He always voted against the war, but as uniformly voted supplies to the army on the ground that the soldiers were not responsible and must be fed. His opponents in Illinois undertook to call him "Spot" Lincoln and charged him with disloyalty, for all this. He had to meet it many times in the debates with Senator Douglas. But conscience was becoming freer and the expression of it easier and stronger through its exercise in the face of opposition.

Another advance was made through his resolutions in this Congress for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. It is true he satisfied his lawyer mind by providing that it should be upon the majority vote of the District, and that owners should be paid for their slaves, but it gave fresh help to freedom and it went further in cheering Lincoln's sense of justice and his moral courage on their way.

In another ten years we come to the greatest voluntary and moral advance in Lincoln's purely political career. They were years of events which would themselves seem very great but for the greater and nobler ones for which they were unexpectedly opening the way. The hope of the convention that formed the Constitution, that the nation would become wholly free, had proved vain. It was only too apparent that it was in peril of becoming wholly slave. Twice in these ten years Congress had swept away the most solemn compacts which established the bulwarks of at least a sectional freedom. The Supreme Court had decided that slaves might be taken into the territories and yet held and trafficked in. Lincoln feared, with reason enough, that the court would go on and hold that slavery might, with only technical legal limitations, be carried into the free states. The spirit of slavery, rather than that of freedom, was finding hospitality in the courts, and opportunity through the law. The machinery for apprehending and returning fugitive slaves had been made more and more drastic. Political parties had been avoiding exact issues, shuffling for votes, and dissolving into factions. Under such circumstances, in the early summer of 1858, Senator Douglas, the recognized leader of the dominant party in his state and in the nation, the readiest political orator of the decade, an undoubted patriot, the friend and rival of Lincoln for twenty-five years, went back to Illinois to prosecute a campaign

for re-election to the Senate upon a platform empowering the territories and the new states to have slavery or not as they should see fit.

Lincoln more than challenged the proposition. He opened up the whole broad question. We had sought peace in compromise, and there was none. Understandings were not kept. The Constitution recognized slavery in the states where it was, and for the sake of the Union he would stand by the Constitution. But he insisted that slavery was inherently wrong, and that there was no moral right and no constitutional power to vote it into territory where it was not. "Senator Douglas is logical," he said, "if you do not admit that slavery is wrong. If you do admit that it is wrong, no one can logically say that he does not care whether it is voted up or voted down." That met the issue; but he went much further. Hope was breaking and extreme patience was wearing out; "A house divided against itself can not stand. This government can not permanently endure half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved. I do not expect the house to fall. I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other."

Illinois was the best example among the states of a house divided against itself. In sentiment and sympathy, if not in legal structure, it was half slave and half free. The northern boundary is in the latitude of Albany. The southern point is four hundred miles away, in the latitude of Richmond. The northern half was settled by people from New York and New England: the southern half by people from Virginia and Kentucky. He had good reason to understand the irrepressibility of the conflict of opinion. He was the first man of recognized attainments who was the acknowledged leader of a party to be reckoned with, who had the moral courage to present an exact issue and stand for an exact result.

He was not an abolitionist. He would leave slavery where it was, rather than invoke war. He cared nothing about social equality; that was a matter aside from the real question and apart from the law. He venerated the Union. It was the very ark of liberty in America and the hope of real liberty in all the world. He knew what it had cost; he understood its legal basis and framework perfectly; he knew what it was worth. He had made friends with Webster in Congress, had been at his table many times, and was his ardent disciple. He was for "Liberty *and* union." There was peril in any separation of the one from the other. He bound them

together as Webster did, and made them his watchwords. It had been manifest enough that without union liberty could not be. It had now become manifest to him that without liberty union could not be. He abhorred war, and he would not afford a ground for war which was repugnant to the Constitution. But he would say definitely that slavery should go no further, and then "rest in the belief that it was in the course of ultimate extinction." If this could not be, he expected it to "become alike lawful in all the states, old as well as new, north as well as south." Then all liberty would be gone, for slavery fetters the master quite as much as the slave.

In the midst of this memorable discussion, Lincoln took one very distinct attitude upon an all-important subject, which strikingly illustrates his legal learning, his familiarity with history, and his moral courage. It concerned the authority and the right of the people to change the Supreme Court, as well as the statute law, when the court persisted in construing the laws so as to vitalize political policies with which the majority had come to be fundamentally at variance. Without questioning the learning or the motives of the court he boldly charged that political feeling was having its expression through the decisions of the court. He unhesitatingly denied any ultimate obligations of the people to be bound by decisions of the courts upon questions of political opinion and policy. He would obey the determination, for he was against chaos and revolution, but he would hesitate not at all in seeking new laws or a new court, to the end that courts might express progress as well as precedents, and that liberty rather than slavery might have its opportunity. He called Jefferson and Jackson to the support of his contention, and he convincingly exemplified the attitudes of many leading men of all parties. Of course, he was charged with an assault upon the Supreme Court, but the immediate result marked another decisive moral advance in his political career, which perhaps gave him the courage to reassert the proposition in his first inaugural, with an ultimate result which appeared in new laws and a new court.

From first to last in all this, Lincoln had acted practically or completely alone. He had gone forward without support from out of the state, and in spite of the protests of his close friends within the state. Indeed, the support of the weightiest influences in his party in the nation was given to his great rival to widen the breach in the opposition party; and his intimate associates within the state, who were of a caliber second only to his own, followed him with

hesitancy and apprehension. With devotion to the equality before the law which in the great fundamental of our political system, with entire self-effacement, with faith in his own opinions, with absolute freedom of movement, and with undoubting confidence in the people, he opened a new chapter in the political history of his country. Senator Douglas won reelection in the Legislature, but the popular sentiment and decisive majority supported the contentions of Mr Lincoln. Freedom had the moral victory. That gave a new and decisive turn to the course of politics in the country, for it showed discerning leaders whither they must lead unless they were disposed to lose. And it made him the presidential nominee, and in due course the president elect.

The point tonight is the influence of it all upon the man. He hardly seemed the same after this. Happily he never lost his humor, but he jested less. He grew in seriousness. He abated not in plainness, but he grew more rugged. He lost nothing of his gentleness and helpfulness, but there was a new reserve in what he said. His practical sagacity never lessened, but his always deepening purposes and his steadily enlarging responsibility kept him more surely in the very middle of the way. At once he became a national figure, but a national figure was not known to the people then as now. Before the result in Illinois he was suggested for the presidential nomination by the more discerning, and with that result the question was more nearly settled than the mere politicians knew. He carried himself to the political culmination with steadiness and firmness. He said nothing to embitter. His lank figure and lean face grew in attractiveness. When it was settled that his course was to be the course of his country, he said what he could to conciliate the opposition, both north and south, but again and again he took precautions to make sure that nothing which had been gained should be lost in weakness or traded away for any temporary political end.

With the departure from Springfield for Washington there was a yet more frequently expressed confidence in the people, and a yet more freely avowed dependence upon God. "I now leave, not knowing when or whether ever I shall return, with a task upon me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being who ever attended him, I can not succeed. With that assistance, I can not fail." All this became more and more pronounced through the presidential years.

We all know the full, fascinating, pathetic, heroic story of his presidency. It was a repetition, day by day, of joys and sorrows, of superb humility and of the fearless exercise of extraordinary powers, of dealings with a cabinet of great men who had nothing but patriotism in common with each other or with him, of efforts to get captains who could command, of apprehension, of victories and defeats, of deaths, of fast days, of deprivations and hardships, of more money and more men, of mitigating the misfortunes of war, of misunderstanding and abuse, of unyielding grip upon all the forces that could maintain the Union which he adored, and of undeviating plan to win the universal freedom which was his passion.

The presidential office is a great school for a great man. It is so at all times. It is even more truly so in war. War takes little notice of the law. In a crisis, monarchs ignore the regular order. But American freemen will not accept the ways of either monarchs or rulers. Happily, Lincoln was not of the stuff of which monarchs are made. He was the leader, not the ruler, of the people. He was the executive of a democracy, the expression of the physical, intellectual, and moral forces that were inherent in twenty millions of freemen. It was for him to make the precedents for the presidential office in a time of civil war. And the precedents which he established have become a priceless inheritance of the nation.

Of course his supreme official responsibilities concerned the conduct of the war and relations with foreign nations. History deals freely with the former, but for obvious reasons is rather reticent about the latter. There were idealists and hotheads who would have embroiled us in foreign wars, for there were foreign powers that would have looked with equanimity upon the dissolution of the Union and the failure of democracy. Lincoln had the responsibility both of war and diplomacy, and hesitated at neither. Management served him with the English. He had to tolerate the antagonistic presence of the French in Mexico. Perhaps he held both in check through the definite and declared friendship of the Czar of all the Russias. With such things as mere interludes to the greater acts which bore upon conflicts in the field and upon the seas, and with the knowledge that he was only the executive of the will of a people, he bore as heavy burdens as ever tried out the soul of man.

Other matters were perhaps quite as trying, though less important, because more immediate and direct. Traders who wanted op-

portunities, sycophants who wanted jobs, captains who wanted to be colonels, committees of senators who wanted the cabinet changed, delegations who wanted generals removed, and doctrinaires who wanted to go through the lines to stop bloodshed by negotiations, thronged the White House day by day.

Happily, there were some things which brought balm to the spirit. Conventions assured him that they trusted him. Men and women told him that they prayed for him. His "plain people" never deserted him. Through all the grave vicissitudes of the situation, the great heart of the nation throbbed strong and true.

And he did things to mitigate the misfortunes of war. In helping the worthy he soothed himself.

In the hall of the White House he one day found a sick woman, with a baby in her arms, mourning to see her husband who was in the Army of the Potomac. He sent her to the hospital and telegraphed the general in command of the division to send that private soldier to Washington to see his wife. He closed his desk one afternoon and crossed the river to see an honest-hearted Vermont farmer boy under sentence of death for going to sleep upon a sentry's post. He talked to him as his father would, pardoned him, and gave him the opportunity to die honorably for his country upon the field of battle. Upon one of his visits to the hospitals his team came upon a mere boy, in the army blue, groping in the roadway. The coachman was annoyed, but the President left his carriage to find that a rifle shot had destroyed both of the soldier's eyes. He comforted the youth with the kindness of greatness, and the next morning made him a lieutenant in the army and transferred him to the retired list, which provided for him for life. When a Washington newspaper that was his severe critic, spoke in commendation of Stonewall Jackson at the time of the melancholy death of that gallant Puritan captain of the Confederacy, Lincoln wrote a note to the editor and thanked him for it. He romped with his boys betimes. He defended the noise that they made, and protected their dogs and goats and ponies. When Willie died, he was close upon the brink. But the exigencies of state allowed little time for a father's grief. Listening to the people through the day, he did the work of the state until late into the night, often with the little boy who was left playing about his chair, and after the child would fall asleep upon the floor the weary father would work on until nature's protest had to be heeded, and then he would gather up the tired child and bear him to the bed they would occupy together.

There were no vacations; no going back to Illinois; until the clouds broke and the final rest came. But duty, responsibility, greatness, never submerged the human interest that from first to last was in the man. Evenness, steadiness, durability, reliability in full measure, helpfulness for every proper end whether great or small, were all his, and they were given to his country in the hour of her need.

It was a spirit pure by nature and grown great by works, a spirit that had suffered inexpressibly but was capable of no resentment; it was the mighty leader of a grief-stricken but triumphant people, that spoke in the second inaugural. The words are as sacred as the scriptures, of which in part they are. Above all men, Lincoln then knew that peace was at hand, as well as he, of all men, knew, at the time his first inaugural was spoken, that war was at hand. In neither case could he say quite all he knew. If there is sorrow and pleading and firmness in the one case, there is poetry and prophecy in the other. With no note of exultation for the victors, with nothing that could touch the sensibilities of the vanquished, he says, "Let us judge not that we be not judged." "With malice toward none: with charity for all." There was no letting down because the culmination was in view. "With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right." As peace was breaking, "Let it be a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

In a few weeks he had joined the world's immortals. With others I waited at the head of the broader State street at the hour of midnight as the cortege came up the street, and governors, senators, and judges, and all the plain people removed their hats as eight sergeants of the army carried the body of Lincoln into the old Capitol. It was an impressive hour, deepened by the darkness, and the overhanging lights and the stars, and tremendously solemn by reason of the grief that filled all hearts. It was said that none would be admitted to the building before eight o'clock in the morning. Then I would hold my place till eight o'clock. But at two o'clock the gates were opened and I passed by the coffin once, and then went around and passed again, to look a second time upon the face that had grown both gentler and stronger through the urgings of a pure and lofty purpose and under the discipline of overwhelming events. He had passed through the wilderness and by the Red sea. Upon his soul and upon his face, God and country had done their perfect work. The moral advance had been unceasing, and he who had become one of the world's immortals had ripened for the immortality of the skies.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
BERKELEY

Return to desk from which borrowed.
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

4XJan 5 4 JB

JAN 5 1954 LU

17 Jan '56 MC

JAN 8 1956 LU

1 Dec '59 VP

REC'D LD

NOV 17 1959

REC'D LD

JAN 19 1960
MAR 21 1960

LD 21-100m-7,'52 (A2528s16)476

162893
LB875
DGA21

